

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 070 685 890



Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

DR. LUTHARDT'S WORKS.

In three handsome crown 8vo volumes, price 6s. each.

'We do not know any volumes so suitable in these times for young men entering on life, or, let us say, even for the library of a pastor called to deal with such, than the three volumes of this series. We commend the whole of them with the utmost cordial satisfaction. They are altogether quite a specialty in our literature.'—*Weekly Review*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES ·

ON THE

FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Fourth Edition.

BY C. E. LUTHARDT, D.D., LEIPZIG.

'From Dr. Luthardt's exposition even the most learned theologians may derive invaluable criticism, and the most acute disputants supply themselves with more trenchant and polished weapons than they have as yet been possessed of.'—*Bell's Weekly Messenger*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES

ON THE

SAVING TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Third Edition.

'Dr. Luthardt is a profound scholar, but a very simple teacher, and expresses himself on the gravest matters with the utmost simplicity, clearness, and force.'—*Literary World*.

APOLOGETIC LECTURES

ON THE

MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY.

Second Edition.

'The ground covered by this work is, of course, of considerable extent, and there is scarcely any topic of specifically moral interest now under debate in which the reader will not find some suggestive saying. The volume contains, like its predecessor, a truly wealthy apparatus of notes and illustrations.'—*English Churchman*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 9s.,

ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

BY PROFESSOR C. E. LUTHARDT,
Author of 'Fundamental Truths of Christianity,' etc.

Translated and the Literature enlarged by C. R. GREGORY, Leipzig.

'A work of thoroughness and value. The translator has added a lengthy Appendix, containing a very complete account of the literature bearing on the controversy respecting this Gospel. The indices which close the volume are well ordered, and add greatly to its value.'—*Guardian*.

'There are few works in the later theological literature which contain such a wealth of sober theological knowledge and such an invulnerable phalanx of objective apologetical criticism.'—*Professor Guericke*.

Crown 8vo, 5s.,

LUTHARDT, KAHNIS, AND BRÜCKNER.

The Church: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position.

'A comprehensive review of this sort, done by able hands, is both instructive and suggestive.'—*Record*.

WORKS BY THE LATE
PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D.D.,

PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

In crown 8vo, price 6s.,

PASTORAL THEOLOGY: A Treatise on the Office and Duties of the Christian Pastor. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author.

'This treatise on the office and duties of a Christian pastor, by the late Professor Fairbairn, is well deserving thoughtful perusal. Throughout the volume, however, there is a tone of earnest piety and practical good sense, which finds expression in many profitable counsels, embodying the result of large experience and shrewd observation... Much of the volume is devoted to the theory and practice of preaching, and this part we can most heartily commend; it is replete with valuable suggestions, which even those who have had some experience in the ministry will find calculated to make them more attractive and efficient preachers.'—*Christian Observer*.

In crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Greek Text and Translation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations.

'We cordially recommend this work to ministers and theological students.'—*Methodist Magazine*.

'We have read no book of his with a keener appreciation and enjoyment than that just published on the Pastoral Epistles.'—*Nonconformist*.

In two volumes, demy 8vo, price 21s., Sixth Edition,

THE TYPOLOGY OF SCRIPTURE, viewed in connection with the whole Series of the Divine Dispensations.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Fourth Edition,

EZEKIEL, AND THE BOOK OF HIS PROPHECY: An Exposition. With a new Translation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d., Second Edition,

PROPHECY, viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretation.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

HERMENEUTICAL MANUAL; or, Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE REVELATION OF LAW IN SCRIPTURE, considered with respect both to its own Nature and to its Relative Place in Successive Dispensations. (The Third Series of the 'Cunningham Lectures'.)

CLARK'S
FOREIGN
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

FOURTH SERIES.

VOL. XLI.

Keil on the Prophecies of Jeremiah and Lamentations.

VOL. I.L

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON,	.	HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.
DUBLIN,	.	ROBERTSON AND CO.
NEW YORK, .	.	SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY
ON
THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY
C. F. KEIL, D.D., AND F. DELITZSCH, D.D.,
PROFESSORS OF THEOLOGY.

THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH,
BY
C. F. KEIL, D.D.

VOL. II.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY
JAMES KENNEDY, B.D.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.
MDCCCLXXX.

B756351
X

CONTENTS.

THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH.

	PAGE
II. SPECIAL PREDICTIONS (<i>continued</i>)—CHAP. XXI.—XXXIII.	
B. The Announcement of Deliverance for all Israel.—Chap. xxx.—xxxiii.,	1
Chap. xxx., xxxi.—Israel's Deliverance and Glorious Condition in the Future,	2
Chap. xxxii.—The Purchase of a Field as a Symbol of the Restoration of Judah after the Exile,	47
Chap. xxxiii. — Renewed Promise of the Restoration and Glorious Condition of the People of God,	60
III. THE LABOUR AND SUFFERING OF THE PROPHET BEFORE AND AFTER THE CONQUEST AND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.—CHAP. XXXIV.—XLV.,	73
A. Prophecies delivered under Zedekiah, and Events of Je-hoiakim's Time—Chap. xxxiv.—xxxvi.	
Chap. xxxiv.—Concerning Zedekiah and the Emancipation of the Men- and Maid-servants,	79
Chap. xxxv.—The Example of the Rechabites,	88
Chap. xxxvi.—Jeremiah's Discourses are written down, and read in the Temple,	93
B. Experiences and Utterances of Jeremiah during the Siege and Capture of Jerusalem.—Chap. xxxvii.—xxxix.	
Chap. xxxvii.—Declaration regarding the Issue of the Siege ; Imprisonment of Jeremiah and Conversation with the King, .	104
Chap. xxxviii.—Jeremiah in the Miry Pit. Last Interview with the King,	108
Chap. xxxix.—Capture of Jerusalem ; Fate of Zedekiah and Jeremiah. Consolatory Message to Ebedmelech,	116
C. Jeremiah's Predictions and Experiences after the Destruction of Jerusalem.—Chap. xl.—xlv.	
Chap. xl., xli.—Liberation of Jeremiah. Murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael, and its Results,	125

	PAGE
Chap. xlvi.—The Word of God concerning the Flight to Egypt,	139
Chap. xlvi.—The Flight to Egypt: the Conquest of Egypt predicted,	146
Chap. xlvi.—Warning against Idolatry, and Intimation of its Punishment,	155
Chap. xlvi.—A Promise addressed to Baruch,	170
IV. PROPHECIES DIRECTED AGAINST FOREIGN NATIONS.—CHAP.	
XLVI.—LI.,	173
Chap. xlvi.—On Egypt,	177
Chap. xvii.—Concerning the Philistines,	197
Chap. xviii.—Concerning Moab,	204
Chap. xli.—Concerning Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar, Hazor, Elam,	235
Chap. I., li.—Against Babylon,	262
APPENDIX—	
Chap. lii.—Historical Account of the Capture and Destruction of Jerusalem, the Fate of Zedekiah and the People, and the Liberation of Jehoiachin from Imprisonment,	322

THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. The Name, Contents, and Arrangement of the Book,	335
§ 2. The Author, Time of Composition, and Position in the Canon,	339

EXPOSITION.

Chap. i.—Sorrow and Wailing over the Fall of Jerusalem and Judah,	355
Chap. ii.—Lamentation over the Judgment of Destruction that has come on Zion and the Desolation of Judah,	379
Chap. iii.—The Suffering and the Consolation of the Gospel,	400
Chap. iv.—Submission under the Judgment of God, and Hope,	429
Chap. v.—A Prayer to the Lord by the Church, languishing in Misery, for the Restoration of her former State of Grace,	445

THE PROPHECIES OF JEREMIAH.

B. THE ANNOUNCEMENT OF DELIVERANCE FOR ALL ISRAEL.— CHAP. XXX.—XXXIII.

JN view of the impending fall of the kingdom of Judah, Jeremiah seeks to present the godly with a strong anchor of hope in the realization of God's gracious promises, which were to be fulfilled after the appointed season of punishment had passed. For this purpose, after predicting the ills of exile times, the prophet gives a comprehensive statement concerning the deliverance which the Lord will vouchsafe to His people in the future, and gathers together the repeated briefer promises regarding the restoration and glorious condition of Israel and Judah, so as to give a full description of the deliverance intended for all the covenant people under the sceptre of the future David. This detailed announcement of the deliverance consists of a pretty long prophetic address (which Hengstenberg very properly designates "the triumphal hymn of Israel's salvation," chap. xxx. and xxxi.), and two pieces confirmatory of this address, viz.: (1) one recording a symbolical act performed by the prophet at God's command,—the sale of a piece of hereditary property in land during the last siege of Jerusalem, shortly before the breaking up of the kingdom, which commenced with the taking of the city,—together with a message from God explaining this act, chap. xxxii.; and (2) another passage giving, in prophetic language, a renewed promise that Jerusalem and Judah would be restored with the blissful arrangements connected with the Davidic monarchy and the Levitical priesthood, chap. xxxiii. According to the headings given in xxxii. 1 and xxxiii. 1, these two latter pieces belong to the tenth year of Zedekiah's reign;

the address contained in chap. xxx. and xxxi., on the other hand, belongs to a somewhat earlier period, and was not uttered publicly before the people, but simply composed in writing, and meant to be preserved for future use. As regards the exact time of its composition, the views of modern expositors are very dissimilar. While Hengstenberg, with many others, places it in the same period with the allied chapters xxxii. and xxxiii., viz. in the time when Jerusalem was being besieged, immediately before the capture and destruction of the city, Nägelsbach reckons this address among the oldest portions of the whole book, and assigns its composition to the times of King Josiah, to which iii. 11-25 belongs. But the arguments adduced in support of this view are quite insufficient to establish it. It does not by any means follow from the substantial agreement of the address with that in chap. iii., so far as it exists, that they were both composed at the same time; and if (as Nägelsbach thinks) the fact that there is no mention made of the Chaldeans *were* taken as a criterion of composition before the fourth year of Jehoiakim, then, too, would the address in chap. xxxiii. be put down as having been composed before that year, but in glaring contradiction to the inscription given xxxiii. 1. And as little reason is there for inferring, with Hengstenberg, from xxx. 5-7, that the final catastrophe of Jeremiah's time is represented as still imminent; for these verses do not refer at all to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. That learned writer is, however, quite correct in his remark, that the prophet takes his stand-point within the period of the catastrophe, as if it had already begun, but that this time is an ideal present, so that we must not allow ourselves to be deceived as to the time of composition by the circumstance that, generally, Judah no less than Israel appears to be already in a state of exile, far from the land of the Lord. The time of composition cannot be made out with perfect certainty. Yet there is nothing against the assumption that it is the tenth year of Zedekiah.

Chap. xxx. and xxxi. *Israel's Deliverance and Glorious Condition in the Future.*

A great day of judgment, before which all the world trembles, will bring to Israel deliverance from the yoke imposed on them.

The Lord will bring them out of the land of their captivity (xxx. 4-11). He will bind up and heal the wounds which He inflicted on them because of their sins; will render to those who oppressed and chastised them according to their deeds (vers. 12-17); will again build up His kingdom, and render His people glorious, both in temporal and spiritual respects (vers. 18-22). The wrath of the Lord will be poured forth upon all evil-doers like a tempest, till He has performed the thoughts of His heart at the end of the days (vers. 23, 24). At that time the Lord will become the God of all the families of Israel, and show them favour as His own people (xxxi. 1-6); He will also gather the remnant of Israel out of the land of the north, lead them back into their inheritance, and make them glad and prosperous through His blessing (vers. 7-14); the sorrow of Ephraim will He change to joy, and He will perform a new thing in the land (vers. 15-22). In like manner will He restore Judah, and make want to cease (vers. 23-26). Israel and Judah shall be raised to new life (vers. 27-30), and a new covenant will be made with them, for the Lord will write His law in their heart and forgive their sins (vers. 31-34). Israel shall for ever remain the people of God, and Jerusalem be built anew to the honour of the Lord, and, as a holy city, shall no more be laid waste for ever (vers. 35-40).

This address forms a united whole which divides into two halves. In chap. xxx. 4-22 it is the deliverance of Israel in general that is set forth; while in the passage from chap. xxx. 23 on to the end of chap. xxxi. it is deliverance, more especially in reference to Israel and Judah, that is portrayed. As there is no doubt about its unity, so neither is there any well-founded doubt regarding its genuineness and integrity. Hence the assertion of Hitzig, that, as a whole, it exhibits such a want of connection, such constant alternation of view-point, so many repetitions, and such irregularity in the structure of the verses, that there seems good ground for suspecting interpolation,—such an assertion only shows the inability of the expositor to put himself into the course of thought in the prophetic word, to grasp its contents properly, and to give a fair and unprejudiced estimate of the whole. Hitzig would reject xxxi. 38-40, and Nägelsbach xxx. 20-24, as later additions, but in neither case

is this admissible; and Kueper (*Jeremias*, p. 170 sqq.) and Graf, in his Commentary, have already so well shown with what little reason Movers and Hitzig have supposed they had discovered so many “interpolations,” that, in our exposition, we merely intend to take up in detail some of the chief passages.

Chap. xxx. 1-3. INTRODUCTION, AND STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT.—Ver. 1. “The word which came to Jeremiah from Jahveh, saying: Ver. 2. Thus hath Jahveh the God of Israel said: Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book; Ver. 3. For, behold, days come, saith Jahveh, when I shall turn the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith Jahveh, and I shall bring them back to the land which I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it.”

Ver. 1 contains the heading not merely of vers. 2 and 3, as Hitzig erroneously maintains, but of the whole prophecy, in chap. xxx. and xxxi. Vers. 2 and 3 form the introduction. Jeremiah is to write the following word of God in a book, because it refers to times still future,—regards the deliverance of Israel and Judah from exile, which will not take place till afterwards. In assigning the reason for the command to write down the word of God that had been received, there is at the same time given the subject of the prophecy which follows. From this it is further evident that the expression “all the words which I have spoken to thee” cannot, like xxxvi. 2, be referred, with J. D. Michaelis, to the whole of the prophecies which Jeremiah had up till that time received; it merely refers to the following prophecy of deliverance. The perfect *לִבְרַת* is thus not a preterite, but only expresses that the address of God to the prophet precedes the writing down of the words he received. As to the expression *שָׁבֵת שָׁבָת*, see on xxix. 14.

Vers. 4-11. The judgment on the nations for the deliverance of Israel.—Ver. 4. “And these are the words which Jahveh spake concerning Israel and Judah: Ver. 5. For thus saith Jahveh: We have heard a cry of terror, fear, and no peace. Ver. 6. Ask now, and see whether a male bears a child? Why do I see every man with his hands on his loins like a woman

in childbirth, and every face turned to paleness? Ver. 7. Alas! for that day is great, with none like it, and it is a time of distress for Jacob, but he will be saved out of it. Ver. 8. And it shall come to pass on that day, saith Jahveh of hosts, that I will break his yoke from upon thy neck, and I will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more put servitude on him; Ver. 9. But they shall serve Jahveh their God, and David their king, whom I shall raise up to them. Ver. 10. But fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith Jahveh, neither be confounded, O Israel; for, behold, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be at rest, and be secure, and there shall be none making him afraid. Ver. 11. For I am with thee, saith Jahveh, to save thee; for I will make an end of all the nations whither I have scattered thee, yet of thee will I not make an end, but I will chastise thee properly and will not let thee go quite unpunished."

With ver. 4 is introduced the description of Israel's restoration announced in ver. 3. This introduction is not absolutely necessary, but neither is it for that reason spurious and to be expunged, as Hitzig seeks to do; it rather corresponds to the breadth of Jeremiah's representation. The 'בָּ' in ver. 5 is explicative: "Thus, namely, hath Jahveh spoken." With the lively dramatic power of a poet, the prophet at once transports the hearers or readers of his prophecy, in thought, into the great day to come, which is to bring deliverance to all Israel. As a day of judgment, it brings terror and anguish on all those who live to see it. תְּרִידָה בַּיּוֹם, "A voice (sound) of trembling (or terror) we hear," viz. the people, of whom the prophet is one. פְּחַד does not depend on שְׁמָעָה, but forms with שְׁלָמָה an independent clause: "There is fear and not peace" (or safety). Ver. 6. What is the cause of this great horror, which makes all men, from convulsive pains, hold their hands on their loins, so as to support their bowels, in which they feel the pangs, and which makes every countenance pale? In ver. 7 the cause of this horror is declared. It is the great day of judgment that is coming. "That (not *this*) day" points to the future, and thus, even apart from other reasons, excludes the supposition that it is the day of the destruction of Jerusalem that is

meant. The words “that day is great” refer to Joel ii. 11, and “there is none like it” is an imitation of Joel ii. 2; in the latter passage the prophet makes use of a judgment which he had seen passed on Judah,—its devastation by locusts,—and for the first time presents, as the main element in his prophecy, the idea of the great day of judgment to come on all nations, and by which the Lord will perfect His kingdom on this earth. This day is for Jacob also, *i.e.* for all Israel, a time of distress; for the judgment falls not merely on the heathen nations, but also on the godless members of the covenant people, that they may be destroyed from among the congregation of the Lord. The judgment is therefore for Israel as well as for other nations a critical juncture, from which the Israel of God, the community of the faithful, will be delivered. This deliverance is described more in detail in ver. 8 ff. The Lord will break the yoke imposed on Israel, free His people from all bondage to strangers, *i.e.* the heathen, so that they may serve only Him, the Lord, and David, His king, whom He will raise up. The suffix in יְהֹוָה is referred by several expositors (Hitzig, Nägelsbach) to the king of Babylon, “as having been most clearly before the minds of Jeremiah and his contemporaries;” in support of this view we are pointed to Isa. x. 27, as a passage which may have been before the eyes of Jeremiah. But neither this parallel passage nor צִוָּאָרָךְ (with the suffix of the second person), which immediately follows, sufficiently justifies this view. For, in the second half also of the verse, the second person is interchanged with the third, and מְסֻרָּתְּךָ, which is parallel with יְהֹוָה, requires us to refer the suffix in the latter word to Jacob, so that “his yoke” means “the yoke laid on him,” as in 1 Kings xii. 4, Isa. ix. 3. It is also to be borne in mind that, throughout the whole prophecy, neither Babylon nor the king of Babylon is once mentioned; and that the judgment described in these verses cannot possibly be restricted to the downfall of the Babylonian monarchy, but is the judgment that is to fall upon all nations (ver. 11). And although this judgment begins with the fall of the Babylonian supremacy, it will bring deliverance to the people of God, not merely from the yoke of Babylon, but from every yoke which strangers have laid or will lay on them.—Ver. 9. Then Israel

will no longer serve strangers, *i.e.* foreign rulers who are heathens, but their God Jahveh, and David the king who will be raised up to them, *i.e.* the Messiah, the righteous sprout that Jahveh will raise up to David; cf. xxiii. 5. The designation of this sprout as “David their king,” *i.e.* the king of the Israelites, points us back to Hos. iii. 5.—Ver. 10 f. Israel the servant of Jahveh, *i.e.* the true Israel, faithful and devoted to God, need thus fear nothing, since their God will deliver them from the land of their captivity, and stand by them as their deliverer, so that they shall be able to dwell in peace and undisturbed security in their own land. For Jahveh will make a complete end of all the nations among whom Israel has been scattered; Israel, on the other hand, He shall certainly chastise, but **לפָשָׁט** (according to what is right, in due measure), that they may be made better by their punishment. As to the expression **לפָשָׁט בַּלְהָ**, see on x. 24; for **עָשָׂה בַּלְהָ**, see on iv. 27 and v. 18 (**אָתֵךְ** for **אָתָּךְ**, v. 18); and lastly, on **נָקַה לְאָנָקָה**, cf. Ex. xxxiv. 47, Num. xiv. 18, Nah. i. 3.—Vers. 10 and 11 are repeated in xlvi. 27, 28, though with some slight changes.¹

Vers. 12-17. *Because Israel has been severely chastised for his sins, the Lord will now punish his enemies, and heal Israel.*
—Ver. 12. “For thus saith Jahveh: It is ill with thy bruise, thy wound is painful. Ver. 13. There is none to judge thy cause; for a sore, healing-plaster there is none for thee. Ver. 14. All thy lovers have forgotten thee, thee they seek not; for I have wounded thee with the wound of an enemy, the chastisement of a cruel one, because of the multitude of thine iniquity, [because] thy sins were numerous. Ver. 15. Why

² The general strain of these verses is the same as that of the second portion of Isaiah; hence Hitzig, following Movers, views them as an interpolation made by the reviser. But this view is most incorrect, as Graf has already pointed out. The only expression which, besides the repetition made in xlvi. 27, occurs nowhere else in Jeremiah, but frequently in the second Isaiah, is, "my servant Jacob;" cf. Isa. xliv. 1, 2, xlvi. 4, xlvi. 20 and xli. 8, xliv. 21, xlvi. 3. All the rest is not characteristic of Isaiah. "Thus, 'Fear not, I am with thee,' is certainly found in Isa. xlvi. 5, but also in Gen. xxvi. 24; 'Fear not, neither be afraid,' is found in a like connection in Isa. li. 7, but also in Jer. xxiii. 24, Deut. i. 21, xxxi. 8, Josh. viii. 1; cf. Isa. xliv. 2, Jer. i. 8, 17, Josh. i. 9. בָּרוּךְ occurs also in vers. 7, 10, 25, Lam. ii. 3. For מַזְעִיךְ, cf. xiv. 8; for מַרְחָקְ, cf. xxiii. 23, xxxi. 3,

criest thou over thy bruise, — [because] thy wound is bad? Because of the multitude of thine iniquity, [because] thy sins were numerous, have I done these things to thee. Ver. 16. Therefore all those who devour thee shall be devoured; and all thine oppressors, they shall all go into captivity; and they who spoiled thee shall become a spoil, and those that plundered thee I will give up for plunder. Ver. 17. For I will put a plaster on thee, and will heal thee of thy wounds, saith Jahveh; for they call thee an outcast, [and say], Zion is she [whom] none seeketh after."

This strophe is only a fuller expression of the idea set forth in ver. 11, that the Lord certainly chastises Israel, but will not make an end of him. The chastisement has commenced. From the wounds and blows which Israel has received, he lies motionless and helpless, getting neither sympathy nor aid from his lovers. The feminine suffix and the mention of lovers show that the address turns to the daughter of Zion. On the expression אָנָשׁ לְשִׁבְרָה, "it is ill with thy bruise," cf. xv. 18. נַחַלָה מִפְהָה, "bad, incurable is the stroke which thou hast received," as in x. 19, xiv. 17. יִזְעַל, "to execute justice;" cf. v. 28, xxii. 16. Hitzig well explains the meaning: "thy claims against thy heathen oppressors." מְטוֹר, although connected by the accents with what precedes, does not agree well with יִזְעַל; for מְטוֹר has not the meaning which has been attributed to it, of a "bandage," but, as derived from the verb וָר, "to press a wound," signifies the wound that has been pressed together; see on Hos. v. 13. Neither does the figure of the wound agree with the expression, "there is none to judge

li. 50. In the second part of Isaiah, שָׁעַן occurs as seldom as ; and אָנָן מְחִירֵיד; on the other hand, cf. Jer. xlviii. 11, vii. 33. The expressions found in ver. 11 are as rare in the second part of Isaiah as they are frequent in Jeremiah. Thus, 'For I am with thee to save thee' is found in xv. 20, xlvi. 11; 'to make a full end' occurs also in iv. 27, v. 10, 18; 'I shall certainly not let thee go unpunished,' which, like Nah. i. 3, seems to have been taken from Ex. xxxiv. 7 or Num. xiv. 18, is not found at all in the second part of Isaiah; הַקְפִין, which is found in ix. 15, xiii. 24, xviii. 17, xxiii. 1 f., appears only in Isa. xli. 16; and while יִפְרַר לְמִשְׁפָט is used in the same meaning in x. 24, יִפְרַר occurs nowhere in the second part of Isaiah, and לְמִשְׁפָט is found in Isa. xli. 1, liv. 17, lix. 11, in quite a different connection and meaning." (Graf.)

thy cause," so that we might, with Umbreit, render the passage, "No one gives thee thy due, in pressing thy wounds;" while, as Graf says, "רְפָאֹת" dissociated from לְמוֹר forms a useless synonym with עַלְלָה," and in xlvi. 11, where the thought is repeated, it is separated from the latter word. Accordingly, with Hitzig and Graf, we connect לְמוֹר רְפָאֹת into one clause: "for the wound, there is no healing (or medicine)—no plaster." עַלְלָה is what is laid upon the wound, a plaster. "All thy lovers," i.e. the nations which were once allied with thee (cf. xxii. 20 and 22), do not trouble themselves about thee, because I have smitten thee so heavily on account of the multitude of thy transgressions; cf. v. 6, xiii. 22. עַצְמָה still depends on the preposition לְ, which continues its force, but as a conjunction. The idea that the Israelites have richly deserved their sufferings is still more plainly presented in ver. 15: "Why criest thou, because thou hast brought this suffering on thee through thy sins?" עַנְנָא also depends on לְ, which continues to exert its power in the sentence as a conjunction.—Ver. 16 f. Therefore (i.e. because Israel, although punished for his sins, is destitute of help) will the Lord take pity on him. He will recompense to his oppressors and spoilers according to their deeds, and will heal his wounds. The enemies of Zion will now meet the fate which they have prepared for Zion. Those who, like rapacious animals, would devour Israel (see on ii. 3), shall be devoured, and all his oppressors shall go into captivity; cf. xxii. 22. The *Kethib* שָׁבֵשׁ is the Aramaic form of the participle from שָׁבֵשׁ for סָבֵשׁ; the *Qeri* substitutes the Hebrew form שָׁבֵשׁ, after l. 11, Isa. xvii. 14. אָרְכָה אַלְלָה, to put on a bandage, lay on a plaster. אָרְכָה signifies, primarily, not a bandage, but, like the Arabic أَرْبَعَة (according to Fleischer in Delitzsch on Isa. lviii. 8), the new skin which forms over a wound as it heals, and (as is shown by the expression of Isaiah, אָרְכָתָה-תִּצְמַח) proves the healing of the wound. Against the direct transference of the meaning of the word in Arabic to the Hebrew אָרְכָה, without taking into consideration the passage in Isaiah just referred to, there is the objection that the word is always used in connection with הַלְלָה, "to be put on" (cf. viii. 22, 2 Chron. xxiv. 13, Neh. iv. 1), or הַעַלְלָה, "to put on" (here and in xxxiii. 6),

which is not the proper verb to be used in speaking of the formation of a new skin over a wound after suppuration has ceased. Hence the word in Hebrew seems to have received the derived sense of “a healing-plaster;” this is confirmed by the employment of the word **מְלֻעָה**, “plaster,” in ver. 13 and xlvi. 11.—The second **בָּ**, ver. 17, is subordinate to the clause which precedes. “Because they called thee one rejected,” i.e. because the enemies of Zion spoke of her contemptuously, as a city that has been forsaken of God, the Lord will heal her wounds.

Vers. 18-22. *Further explanation of the deliverance promised to Zion.*—Ver. 18. “Thus saith Jahveh: Behold, I will turn the captivity of the tents of Jacob, and will take pity on his dwellings; and the city shall be built again upon its own hill, and the palace shall be inhabited after its own fashion. Ver. 19. And there shall come forth from them praise and the voice of those who laugh; and I will multiply them, so that they shall not be few, and I will honour them, so that they shall not be mean. Ver. 20. And his sons shall be as in former times, and his congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress him. Ver. 21. And his leader shall spring from himself, and his ruler shall proceed from his midst; and I will bring him near, so that he shall approach to me; for who is he that became surety for his life in drawing near to me? saith Jahveh. Ver. 22. And ye shall become my people, and I will be your God.”

The dwellings of Israel that have been laid waste, and the cities that have been destroyed, shall be restored and inhabited as formerly, so that songs of praise and tones of joy shall resound from them (ver. 18 f.). “The captivity of the tents of Jacob” means the miserable condition of the dwellings of Jacob, i.e. of all Israel; for “to turn the captivity” has everywhere a figurative sense, and signifies the turning of adversity and misery into prosperity and comfort; see on xxix. 14. Hitzig is quite wrong in his rendering: “I bring back the captives of the tents of Jacob, i.e. those who have been carried away out of the tents.” That “tents” does not stand for those who dwell in tents, but is a poetic expression for “habitations,” is perfectly clear from the parallel “his dwellings.” To “take

pity on the dwellings" means to "restore the dwellings that have been destroyed" (cf. ix. 18). The anarthrous עיר must not be restricted to the capital, but means every city that has been destroyed ; here, the capital naturally claims the first consideration. "Upon its hills" is equivalent to saying on its former site, cf. Josh. xi. 13 ; it does not mean "on the mound made by its ruins," in support of which Nägelsbach erroneously adduces Deut. xiii. 17. נִרְמֹן in like manner stands, in the most general way, for every palace. על-מִשְׁפָט does not mean "on the proper place," i.e. on an open, elevated spot on the hill (Hitzig), neither does it mean "on its right position" (Ewald) ; both of these renderings are against the usage of the words : but it signifies "according to its right" (cf. Deut. xvii. 11), i.e. in accordance with what a palace requires, after its own fashion. יְשַׁב, to be inhabited, as in xvii. 6, etc. "Out of them" refers to the cities and palaces. Thence proceeds, resounds praise or thanksgiving for the divine grace shown them (cf. xxxiii. 11), and the voice, i.e. the tones or sounds, of those who laugh (cf. xv. 17), i.e. of the people living in the cities and palaces, rejoicing over their good fortune. "I will increase them, so that they shall not become fewer," cf. xxix. 6 ; "I will bring them to honour (cf. Isa. viii. 23), so that they shall not be lightly esteemed."—In ver. 20 f. the singular suffixes refer to Jacob as a nation (ver. 18). "His sons" are the members of the nation ; they become as they were previously, in former times,—*sicut olim sub Davide et Salomone, florentissimo rerum statu.* "The congregation will be established before me," i.e. under my survey (מִפְנִים as in Ps. cii. 29), i.e. they shall no more be shaken or moved from their position.—Ver. 21. The expression "his prince will be out of him" is explained by the parallel clause, "his ruler will proceed from him." The meaning is, that the people will no longer be ruled or subdued by foreign masters, but be ruled by glorious princes, i.e. leaders endowed with princely glory, and these out of the midst of themselves. Herein is contained the truth, that the sovereignty of Israel, as restored, culminates in the kingdom of the Messiah. Yet the words employed are so general that we cannot restrict אֲדִירוֹן and מְשִׁלֵּן to the person of the Messiah. The idea is to be taken in a more general way : As Israel was ruled by princes

of the house of David, whom God had chosen, so will it again in the future have its own rulers, whom God will raise out of their midst and exalt gloriously. This is clear from the further statement, “I will cause him to approach, and he shall come near unto me.” To affirm that these words do not refer to the ruler, but to the people, is a mistake that could be made only by those expositors who view the “ruler” as being none else than the Messiah. Yet the LXX. and the Chaldee paraphrase understood the words as referring to the people; and in support of this view, it may be asserted that, in the Messianic period, Israel is to become a holy people (iii. 17), and attain its destiny of being a nation of priests (Ex. xix. 6), in reference to which it is called עם קדשׁ, Ps. cxlviii. 14. But the context evidently requires us to refer the words to the king, with regard to whom one here looks for a further statement. The verb קָרַב is the regular expression employed in reference to the approach on the part of the priests to Jahveh, cf. Num. xvi. 5; and נִשְׁאַל in Ex. xxiv. 2 denotes the approach of Moses to Jahveh on Mount Sinai. The two verbs thus signify a bringing near and a coming near, which, under the old covenant, was the prerogative of those persons who were consecrated by the Lord to be servants in His sanctuary, but was denied the common people. As to the kings of Israel, in regard to this matter, the ordinance proclaimed concerning Joshua held good in reference to them also: “he shall stand before Eleazar, who shall inquire for him in a matter of Urim before Jahveh” (Num. xxvii. 21). Even a David could not approach into the immediate presence of the Lord to ask His will. This prerogative of the priests the Lord will, in the future, vouchsafe also to the princes of Israel, *i.e.* He will then put them in such a relation to Himself as no one may now presume to occupy, except at the risk of his life. This is shown by the succeeding sentence, which assigns the reason: “For who is there that stands surety for his heart, *i.e.* with his heart answers for the consequences of approaching me?” לְבָבָךְ and not נֶפֶשׁ is named, as the seat of physical life, in so far as the heart is the place where the soul is alone with itself, and becomes conscious of all it does and suffers as its own (Oehler in Delitzsch’s *Psychology*, p. 296 of Clark’s Translation). The meaning is, that nobody will stake his spiritual-

moral life on any attempt to draw near to God, because a sinful man is destroyed before the holiness of the Divine Being. Whoever approaches into the presence of Jahveh must die; Num. viii. 19; Ex. xix. 21, xxxiv. 3, etc.—Ver. 22. Then Israel shall really become the people of the Lord, and the Lord shall be their God; thus the end of their divine calling shall be attained, and the salvation of Israel shall be complete; see on vii. 23.

Vers. 23, 24. *The wicked shall be destroyed by the fire of God's anger.*—Ver. 23. “Behold, a whirlwind of Jahveh,—wrath goeth forth,—a sweeping whirlwind; it shall hurl down on the head of the wicked. Ver. 24. The heat of Jahveh's anger shall not return till He hath done and till He hath established the purpose of His heart; in the end of the days ye shall consider it.”

These two verses have been already met with in chap. xxiii. 19 and 20, with a few variations. Instead of מְתַחְזֵלֶל we have here מְתַגְּזֵר, and אָפָּהָרָה is here strengthened by prefixing חָרָזָן; on the other hand, בִּנְהָה, which is added in the preceding passage to intensify הַתְּבִונָה, is here omitted. The first of these changes is more of a formal than a real kind; for by the substitution of מְתַחְזֵלֶל for מְתַגְּזֵר, the play in the latter word on לִילָה is merely disturbed, not “destroyed,” since ר and ל are kindred sounds. מְתַגְּזֵר has been variously rendered. The meaning of “abiding,” which is founded on 1 Kings xvii. 20, is here unsuitable. Equally inappropriate is the meaning of “crowding together,” or assembling in troops, which we find in Hos. vii. 14. It is more correct to derive it from גַּרְגַּל, either in the sense of sweeping away or that of blustering, which are meanings derived from the fundamental one of producing harsh sounds in the throat, and transferred to the rushing sound made by the storm as it carries everything along with it. The second and third changes affect the sense. For, by the addition of חָרָזָן to אָפָּהָרָה, the idea of a judgment in wrath is intensified; and by dropping בִּנְהָה, less is made of the acuteness of perception. Both of these variations correspond to differences in the context of both passages. In chap. xxiii., where the words are applied to the false prophets, it was important to place emphasis on the statement that these men would, by experience, come to a

full knowledge of the reality of that judgment they denied ; in this chapter, on the other hand, the idea of judgment in wrath must be expressly set aside. There is thus no good ground for considering these verses a later interpolation into the text, as Movers, Hitzig, and Nägelsbach think. Hitzig rejects these verses as spurious on the false ground that the judgment threatened in this chapter refers merely to the fall of the kingdom of Babylon, which Jeremiah could not have been able to know beforehand ; Nägelsbach rejects them on the ground of other erroneous assumptions.¹—The only doubtful point regarding these verses is, whether they are to be connected, as Hengstenberg thinks, with what precedes, or with what follows, as Ewald supposes. In the former case, to the promise for the true Israel would be added a threat against those who only seemed to be Israel,—like the declaration in Isaiah, “ There is no peace to the wicked :” this addition would thus be made, lest those for whom the promise was not intended should unwarrantably apply it to themselves. But, however well-founded the thought is, that every increasing manifestation of grace is invariably accompanied by an increased manifestation of righteousness, and though all the prophets clearly testify that the godless members of the covenant people have no share in the promised salvation, but instead are liable to judgment ; yet there has not been such preparation made for the introduction of this thought as that we might be able at once to join these two verses to what precedes. The exclamation “ Behold !” with which the words are introduced, rather form a sign that a new addition is to be made to the prophecy. We therefore view the threat in this verse as a resumption of the threat of judgment made in ver. 5 ff., to

¹ First, he holds the groundless opinion that this prophecy originated in the time of Josiah, and therefore could not have borrowed verses from the address given in chap. xxiii., which belongs to the time of Jehoiakim ; secondly, with as little ground he affirms that these verses do not correspond with the character of the chapter, and seem like a jarring discord in the midst of the announcement of deliverance it contains ; finally, he asks whence could come “ the wicked ” mentioned, in the times described by the prophet,—as if he thought that when the captivity of the people was turned, all godless ones would suddenly disappear.—The doubts as to the genuineness of ver. 22 are based by Nägelsbach merely on the fact that the same idea is repeated in xxxi. 1.

which is attached, in xxxi. 1, the further development of the announcement of deliverance ; but we refer the threat made in the verse not merely to the heathen as such, but to all “ wicked ones,” in such a way that it at the same time applies to the godless members of the covenant people, and signifies their exclusion from salvation.

Chap. xxxi. **THE SALVATION FOR ALL THE FAMILIES OF ISRAEL.**—Ewald has well stated the connection of this chapter with the conclusion of the preceding, as follows : “ In order that the old form of blessing, found in the books of Moses, and here given in ver. 22, may be fulfilled, the whirlwind of Jahveh, which must carry away all the unrighteous, will at last discharge itself, as has been already threatened, xxiii. 19 ; this must take place in order that there may be a fulfilment of that hope to *all* the tribes of Israel (both kingdoms).” Ver. 1 announces deliverance for all the families of Israel, but afterwards it is promised to both divisions of the people separately,—first, in vers. 2-22, to the ten tribes, who have been exiles the longest ; and then, in a more brief statement, vers. 23-26, to the kingdom of Judah : to this, again, there is appended, vers. 27-40, a further description of the nature of the deliverance in store for the two houses of Israel.

Vers. 1-6. The deliverance for all Israel, and the readmission of the ten tribes.—Ver. 1. “ At that time, saith Jahveh, will I be a God to all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people. Ver. 2. Thus saith Jahveh : A people escaped from the sword found grace in the wilderness. Let me go to give him rest, even Israel. Ver. 3. From afar hath Jahveh appeared unto me, and with everlasting love have I loved thee ; therefore have I continued my favour towards thee. Ver. 4. Once more will I build thee up, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel ; once more shalt thou adorn [thyself] with thy tabrets, and go forth in the dance of those that make merry. Ver. 5. Once more shalt thou plant vineyards on the hills of Samaria ; planters will plant them, and apply them to common use. Ver. 6. For there is a day [when] watchmen will cry on Mount Ephraim : Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion, to Jahveh our God ! ”

The expression “At that time” refers to xxx. 24, “in the end of the days,” which means the Messianic future. The announcement of deliverance itself is continued by resumption of the promise made in xxx. 22 ; the transposition of the two portions of the promise is to be remarked. Here, “I will be a God to them” stands first, because the restoration and perfection of Israel have their only foundation in the love of God and in the faithfulness with which He keeps His covenant, and it is only through this gracious act that Israel again becomes the people of God. “All the families of Israel” are the families of the whole twelve tribes,—of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah, separated since the death of Solomon. After this announcement of deliverance for the whole of Israel, the address turns first to Israel of the ten tribes, and continues to treat longest of them, “because, judging from appearances, they seem irrecoverably lost—for ever rejected by the Lord” (Hengstenberg). Ver. 2a is variously explained. Ewald, following Raschi and others, refers the words ‘וְיָמִים בְּנֵי נָצָר’ to the leading of Israel out of Egypt: once on a time, in the Arabian desert, the people that had just barely escaped the sword of the Egyptians nevertheless found grace, when Jahveh, as it were, went to make a quiet dwelling-place for them. The love which He displayed towards them at that time He has since continued, and thus He will now once more bring back His people out of the midst of strangers. This view of the passage is supported by the use of the perfects in vers. 2 and 3, in contrast with the imperfect, “again will I build thee,” ver. 4, and the employment of the expression “in the desert;” cf. ii. 2, Hos. xiii. 4, 5. But “the people of those who have escaped the sword” is an expression that cannot be reconciled with it. Raschi, indeed, understands this as referring to the sword of the Egyptians and Amalekites; but the thought that Israel, led out of Egypt through the Arabian desert, was a people that had survived or escaped the sword, is one met with nowhere else in the Old Testament, and is quite inapplicable to the condition of the people of Israel when they were led out of Egypt. Although Pharaoh wished to exterminate the people of Israel through hard servile labour, and through such measures as the order to kill all male children when they were born, yet he did not make

an exhibition of his wrath against Israel by the sword, neither did he show his anger thus at the Red Sea, where he sought to bring Israel back to Egypt by force. There God shielded His people from the attack of Pharaoh, as He did in the battle against the Amalekites, so that Israel was led through the desert as a whole people, not as a remnant. The designation, “a people escaped from the sword,” unconditionally requires us to refer the words to the deliverance of the Israelites from exile; these were only a remnant of what they had formerly been, since the greater portion of them perished, partly at the downfall of the kingdom, and partly in exile, by the sword of the enemy. Hence the perfects in vers. 2 and 3 are prophetic, and used of the divine counsel, which precedes its execution in time. By using the expression “in the desert,” Jeremiah makes an allusion to Israel’s being led through the Arabian desert. The restoration of Israel to Canaan, from their exile among the nations, is viewed under the figure of their exodus from Egypt into the land promised to their fathers, as in Hos. ii. 16 f.; and the exodus from the place of banishment is, at the same time, represented as having already occurred, so that Israel is again on the march to his native land, and is being safely conducted through the desert by his God. There is as little ground for thinking that there is reference here made to the desert lying between Assyria or Babylon and Palestine, as there is for Hitzig’s referring שִׁירִי חֶרֶב to the sword of the Medes and Persians.—The inf. abs. הַלְּקֹד is used instead of the first person of the imperative (cf. 1 Kings xxii. 30), to express a summons addressed by God to Himself: “I will go.” [See Gesenius, § 131, 4, b, γ.] The suffix in הַרְגִּיעַ points out the object (Israel) by anticipation: “to bring him to rest.” רִגּעַ in the Hiphil usually means to be at rest, to rest (Deut. xxviii. 65); here, to give rest, bring to rest.—Ver. 3. The people already see in spirit how the Lord is accomplishing His purpose, ver. 2b. “From afar (the prophet speaks in the name of the people, of which he views himself as one) hath Jahveh appeared unto me.” So long as Israel languished in exile, the Lord had withdrawn from him, kept Himself far off. Now the prophet sees Him appearing again. “From afar,” i.e. from Zion, where the Lord is viewed as enthroned, the God of His people (Ps. xiv. 7),

sitting there to lead them back into their land. But the Lord at once assures the people, who have been waiting for Him, of His everlasting love. Because He loves His people with everlasting love, therefore has He kept them by His grace, so that they were not destroyed. **שָׁמַד**, to draw, keep, restrain ; hence **שָׁמַדְתִּי**, *prolongare gratiam*, Ps. xxxvi. 11, cix. 12, but construed with **לְ** of a person ; here, with a double accusative, to restrain any one, to preserve him constantly by grace.—Ver. 4. Israel is now to be built up again, *i.e.* to be raised to a permanent condition of ever-increasing prosperity ; cf. xii. 16. The additional clause, “and thou shalt be built,” confirms this promise. The “virgin of Israel” is the congregation of Israel ; cf. xiv. 17. A new and joyful phase in the life of the people is to begin : such is the meaning of the words, “with tabrets shalt thou adorn thyself, and thou shalt go forth in the dance of those who make merry.” In this manner were the popular feasts celebrated in Israel ; cf. Judg. xi. 34, Ps. lxviii. 26.—Ver. 5. “The mountains of Samaria,” *i.e.* of the kingdom of Ephraim (1 Kings xiii. 22 ; 2 Kings xvii. 24), shall again be planted with vineyards, and the planters, too, shall enjoy the fruits in peace,—not plant for strangers, so that enemies shall destroy the fruits ; cf. Isa. lxii. 8 f., lxv. 21 f. The words “planters plant and profane” (*i.e.* those who plant the vineyards are also to enjoy the fruit of them) are to be explained by the law in Lev. xix. 23 f., according to which the fruits of newly planted fruit trees, and according to Judg. ix. 27, vines also, were not to be eaten during the first three years ; those of the fourth year were to be presented as a thank-offering to the Lord ; and only those of the fifth year were to be applied to common use. This application to one’s own use is expressed in Deut. xx. 6 by **לְפָנֶים**, properly, *to make common*.—Ver. 6 is attached to the foregoing by **וְ**, which introduces the reason of what has been stated. The connection is as follows : This prosperous condition of Ephraim is to be a permanent one ; for the sin of Jerohoam, the seduction of the ten tribes from the sanctuary of the Lord, shall not continue, but Ephraim shall once more, in the future, betake himself to Zion, to the Lord his God. “There is a day,” *i.e.* there comes a day, a time, when watchmen call. **נִצְרָנִים** here denotes the watchmen who were posted

on the mountains, that they might observe and give notice of the first appearance of the crescent of the moon after new-moon, so that the festival of the new-moon and the feasts connected with it might be fixed ; cf. Keil's *Bibl. Archäol.* ii. § 74, Anm. 9 [see also the articles *Mond* and *Neumond* in Herzog's *Real-Encykl.* vols. ix. and x. ; *New-moon* in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, vol. ii.]. **נִבְאַת**, to go up to Jerusalem, which was pre-eminent among the cities of the land as to spiritual matters.

Vers. 7-14. *The restoration of Israel.*—Ver. 7. "For thus saith Jahveh : Shout for joy over Jacob, and cry out over the head of the nations ! Make known, praise, and say, O Jahveh, save Thy people, the remnant of Israel ! Ver. 8. Behold, I will bring them out of the land of the north, and will gather them from the sides of the earth. Among them are the blind and lame, the woman with child and she that hath born, together ; a great company shall they return hither. Ver. 9. With weeping shall they come, and with supplications will I lead them : I will bring them to streams of water, by a straight way in which they shall not stumble ; for I have become a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born. Ver. 10. Hear the word of Jahveh, ye nations, and declare among the islands far off, and say : He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd his flock. Ver. 11. For Jahveh hath redeemed Israel and ransomed him out of the hand of one stronger than he. Ver. 12. And they shall come and sing with joy on the height of Zion, and come like a flood to the goodness of Jahveh, because of corn, and new wine, and fresh oil, and the young of the flock and the herd ; and their soul shall be like a well-watered garden, neither shall they pine away any more. Ver. 13. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, and young men and old men together ; and I will turn their mourning to joy, and will comfort them, and will cause them to rejoice after their sorrow. Ver. 14. And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fat, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith Jahveh."

In order to set forth the greatness of the salvation which the Lord will prepare for Israel, so long outcast, Israel is commanded to make loud jubilation, and exhorted to approach the Lord with entreaties for the fulfilment of His purpose of grace. The

statement regarding this salvation is introduced by בַּ, “for,” since the description, given in this strophe, of Israel’s being led back and re-established, furnishes the actual proof that the nation shall be built up again. The summons to rejoice comes from Jahveh (since, by His gracious dealings, He gives the people material for praise), and is addressed to the members of the nation. These are to rejoice over Jacob, *i.e.* over the glorious destiny before the people. צְהַלְךָ בֶּרֶאשׁ הַגּוּם is translated by Hitzig: “shout at the head of the nations,” *i.e.* making a beginning among them all; but this is incorrect and against the context. The thought that many other enslaved nations besides Israel will rejoice over the fall of their oppressors, has not the least foundation in this passage. The summons to the nations, which follows in ver. 10, is simply a command to make known God’s purpose regarding the deliverance of Israel. Of course, בֶּרֶאשׁ, taken literally and by itself, may be rendered “at the head” (1 Kings xxi. 12; Amos vi. 7, etc.); but in this place, the expression of which it forms the first word is the object of צְהַלְךָ, which is construed with בַּ, “to rejoice over something,” Isa. xxiv. 4. “The head of the nations” signifies “the first of the nations” (רִאשֵׁת הַגּוּם, Amos vi. 1), *i.e.* the most exalted among the nations. Such is the designation given to Israel, because God has chosen them before all the nations of the earth to be His peculiar people (Deut. vii. 6; 2 Sam. vii. 23 f.), made them the highest over (לִלְוֹת עַל, Deut. xxvi. 19) all nations. This high honour of Israel, which seemed to have been taken from him by his being delivered over to the power of heathen nations, is now to appear again. הַשְׁמִיעוּ הַלְּלָךְ, “make to be heard, sing praise,” are to be combined into one thought, “sing praise loudly” (so that people may hear it). The words of praise, “Save Thy people, O Jahveh,” form rather the expression of a wish than of a request, just as in many psalms, *e.g.* Ps. xx. 10, xxviii. 9, especially cxviii. 25 in נָא הַשְׁמִיעֵה, with which Jesus was greeted on His entry into Jerusalem, Matt. xxi. 9 (Graf).—To the rejoicing and praise the Lord replies with the promise that He will lead back His people out of the most distant countries of the north,—every one, even the feeble and frail, who ordinarily would not have strength for so long a journey. “Hither,” *i.e.* to Palestine, where Jeremiah

wrote the promise ; cf. iii. 18, xvi. 15.—“ With weeping,” i.e. with tears of joy, and with contrition of heart over favour so undeserved, they come, and God leads them with weeping, “ amidst earnest prayers to the God they have found again, as a lost son returns to the arms of his father” (Umbreit). Hitzig and Graf would connect בְּתַחְנִינִים with what precedes, and combine “ I will lead them, I will bring them ;” by this arrangement, it is said, the careful guidance of God, in leaving nothing behind, is properly set forth. But the symmetry of the verse is thereby destroyed ; and the reason assigned for this construction (which is opposed by the accents), viz. that תַּחְנִינִים does not mean *miseratio, clementia*, will not stand the test. As in Isa. lv. 12 it is the being brought בְּשִׁמְךָ that is the chief point, so here, it is the bringing בְּתַחְנִינִים, amidst weeping, i.e. fervent prayer. At the same time, the Lord will care like a father for their refreshment and nurture ; He will lead them to brooks of water, so that they shall not suffer thirst in the desert (Isa. xlvi. 21), and guide them by a straight (i.e. level) road, so that they shall not fall. For He shows Himself again to Israel as a father, one who cares for them like a father (cf. iii. 19, Deut. xxxii. 6, Isa. lxiii. 16), and treats Ephraim as His first-born. “ The first-born of Jahveh,” in Ex. iv. 22, means the people of Israel as compared with the other nations of the earth. This designation is here transferred to Ephraim as the head and representative of the ten tribes ; but it is not likely that there is in this any allusion to the preference which Jacob displayed for the sons of Joseph, Gen. xlix. 22 ff. compared with ver. 4 (Venema, J. D. Michaelis, Nägelsbach),—the advantage they obtained consisting in this, that Ephraim and Manasseh were placed on an equal footing with Jacob’s sons as regards inheritance in the land of Canaan ; in other words, they were elevated to the dignity of being founders of tribes. There is no trace in this prophecy of any preference given to Ephraim before Judah, or of the ten tribes before the two tribes of the kingdom of Judah. That the deliverance of Ephraim (Israel) from exile is mentioned before that of Judah, and is further more minutely described, is simply due to the fact, already mentioned, that the ten tribes, who had long languished in exile, had the least hope, according to man’s estimation, of deliverance. The

designation of Ephraim as the first-born of Jahveh simply shows that, in the deliverance of the people, Ephraim is in no respect to be behind Judah,—that they are to receive their full share in the Messianic salvation of the whole people; in other words, that the love which the Lord once displayed towards Israel, when He delivered them out of the power of Pharaoh, is also to be, in the future, displayed towards the ten tribes, who were looked on as lost. The nature of fatherhood and sonship, as set forth in the Old Testament, does not contain the element of the Spirit's testimony to our spirit, but only the idea of paternal care and love, founded on the choosing of Israel out of all the nations to be the peculiar people of God; see on Ex. iv. 22 and Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 7. בְּכָר' is substantially the same as בָּנִי and לִלְדָן שָׂעִירִים in ver. 20.—Ver. 10 f. The most remote of the heathen, too, are to be told that Jahveh will free His people from their hands, gather them again, and highly favour them, lest they should imagine that the God of Israel has not the power to save His people, and that they may learn to fear Him as the Almighty God, who has given His people into their power, not from any inability to defend them, but merely for the purpose of chastising them for their sins. מִזְמָרָן are the islands in, and countries lying along the coast of, the Mediterranean Sea; in the language of prophecy, the word is used as a designation of the distant countries of the west; cf. Ps. lxxii. 10, Isa. xli. 1, 5, xlvi. 12, etc. On ver. 10b, cf. xxiii. 3, Ex. xxxiv. 12 ff., Isa. xl. 11. “Stronger than he,” as in Ps. xxxv. 10; the expression is here used of the heathen master of the world.—Vers. 12–14. Thus led by the Lord through the wilderness (ver. 9), the redeemed shall come rejoicing to the sacred height of Zion (see on xvii. 12), and thence go in streams, i.e. scatter themselves over the country like a stream, for the goodness of the Lord, i.e. for the good things which He deals out to them in their native land. “To the goodness of Jahveh” is explained by “because of corn,” etc. (לְעֵדָה for לְאָהָן), cf. Hos. iii. 5. As to the good things of the country, cf. Deut. viii. 8. Their soul will be like a well-watered garden, an emblem of the fulness and freshness of living power; cf. Isa. lviii. 11.—Ver. 13. Then shall young men and old live in unclouded joy, and forget all their former sorrow. “In the dance” refers

merely to the virgins : to “ young men and old together,” only the notion of joy is to be repeated from the context.—Ver. 14. The priests and the people will refresh themselves with the fat, *i.e.* the fat pieces of the thank-offerings, because numerous offerings will be presented to the Lord in consequence of the blessing received from Him.

Vers. 15-22. *Changing of sorrow into joy, because Ephraim will turn to the Lord, and the Lord will lead him back.*—Ver. 15. “ Thus saith Jahveh : A voice is heard in Ramah, lamentation, bitter weeping. Rachel is weeping for her children ; she refuses to be comforted for her children, because they are not. Ver. 16. Thus saith Jahveh : Restrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears ; for there is a reward for thy work, saith Jahveh, and they shall return from the land of the enemy. Ver. 17. And there is hope for thy latter end, saith Jahveh, that children shall return to thy border. Ver. 18. I have certainly heard Ephraim complaining, Thou hast chastised me and I was chastised, like a calf not tamed. Turn me that I may turn, for Thou, O Jahveh, art my God. Ver. 19. For, after I return I repent, and after I have been taught I smite upon [my] thigh ; I am ashamed, yea, and confounded, because I bear the reproach of my youth. Ver. 20. Is Ephraim a son dear to me, or a child of delight, that, as often as I speak against him, I do yet certainly remember him ? Therefore my bowels move for him ; I shall surely pity him, saith Jahveh. Ver. 21. Set thee up way-marks, put up posts for thyself ; set thine heart to the highway, the road [by which] thou camest : return, O virgin of Israel, return to these cities of thine. Ver. 22. How long wilt thou wander about, O backsliding daughter ? For Jahveh hath created a new [thing] in the earth : a woman shall encompass a man.”

In this strophe the promise is further confirmed by carrying out the thought, that Israel’s release from his captivity shall certainly take place, however little prospect there is of it at present. For Israel will come to an acknowledgment of his sins, and the Lord will then once more show him His love. The hopeless condition of Israel is dramatically set forth in ver. 15 f. : Rachel, the mother of Joseph, and thus the ancestress of Ephraim, the chief tribe of the Israelites who had

revolted from the royal house of David, weeps bitterly over the loss of her children, the ten tribes who have been carried away into exile ; and the Lord addresses consolation to her, with the promise that they shall return out of the land of the enemy. “A voice is heard” (עֲמָלֵךְ, participle, to show *duration*). The “voice” is more fully treated of in the second part of the verse : loud lamentation and bitter weeping. There is a difficulty connected with ברמָה. The LXX. took it to be the name of the city *Ramah*, now called *er-Rám*, in the tribe of Benjamin, five English miles north from Jerusalem, on the borders of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (1 Kings xv. 17), although this city is elsewhere written with the article (הַרְמָה), not only in the historical notices found in xl. 1, Josh. xviii. 25, Judg. iv. 5, etc., but also in prophetical addresses, as in Hos. vi. 8, Isa. x. 29. In this passage it cannot be a mere appellative (“on a height”), as in 1 Sam. xxii. 6, Ezek. xvi. 24 ; nor can we think of Ramah in Naphtali (Josh. xix. 36, also הַרְמָה), for this latter city never figures in history like the Ramah of Samuel, not far from Gibeah ; see on Josh. xviii. 25 and 1 Sam. i. 1. But why is the lamentation of Rachel heard at Ramah ? Most expositors reply, because the tomb of Rachel was in the vicinity of Ramah ; in support of this they cite 1 Sam. x. 2. Nägelsbach, who is one of these, still maintains this view with the utmost confidence. But this assumption is opposed to Gen. xxxv. 16 and 19, where it is stated that Rachel died and was buried on the way to Bethlehem, and not far from the town (see on Genesis, *l.c.*), which is about five miles south from Jerusalem, and thus far from Ramah. Nor is any support for this view to be got from 1 Sam. x. 2, except by making the groundless assumption, that Saul, while seeking for the asses of his father, came to Samuel in *his native town* ; whereas, in the account given in that chapter, he is merely said to have sought for Samuel in a certain town, of which nothing more is stated, and to have inquired at him ; see on 1 Sam. x. 2. We must therefore reject, as arbitrary and groundless, all attempts to fix the locality of Rachel’s sepulchre in the neighbourhood of Ramah (Nägelsbach) ; in the same way we must treat the assertion of Thenius, Knobel, Graf, etc., that the Ephratah of Gen. xxxv. 16, 19, is the same as the Ephron of 2 Chron. xiii. 19, which was situated

near Bethel ; so, too, must we deal with the statements, that Ephratah, *i.e.* Bethlehem, is to be expunged from the text of Gen. xxxv. 9 and 48 as a false gloss, and that the tradition, attested in Matt. ii. 18, as to the situation of Rachel's sepulchre in the vicinity of Bethlehem, is incorrect. Nor does the passage of Jeremiah now before us imply that Rachel's sepulchre was near Ramah. Rachel does not weep at Ramah over her lost children, either because she had been buried there, or because it was in Ramah of Benjamin that the exiles were assembled, according to Jer. xl. 1 (Hitzig, and also Delitzsch on Gen. xxxv. 20). For it was the Jews who were to be carried away captive that were gathered together at Ramah, whereas it was over Israelites or Ephraimites that had been carried into exile that Rachel weeps. The lamentation of Rachel is heard at Ramah, as the most loftily situated border-town of the two kingdoms, whence the wailing that had arisen sounded far and near, and could be heard in Judah. Nor does she weep because she has learned something in her tomb of the carrying away of the people, but as their common mother, as the beloved spouse of Jacob, who in her married life so earnestly desired children. Just as the people are often included under the notion of the "daughter of Zion," as their ideal representative, so the great ancestress of Ephraim, Benjamin, and Manasseh is here named as the representative of the maternal love shown by Israel in the pain felt when the people are lost. The sing. **כִּי אִנּוּν** signifies, "for not one of them is left."—This verse is quoted by Matthew (ii. 18), after relating the story of the murder of the children at Bethlehem, with the introductory formula, *τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ρῆθεν διὰ Ἰερεμίου*: from this the older theologians (cf. *Calovii Bibl. illustr. ad Jer. l.c.*) conclude that Jeremiah directly prophesied that massacre of the children committed by Herod. But this inference cannot be allowed ; it will not fit in with the context of the prophecy. The expression *ἐπληρώθη*, used by Matthew, only shows that the prophecy of Jeremiah received a new fulfilment through that act of Herod. Of course, we must not reduce the typical reference of the prophecy to that event at Bethlehem simply to this, that the wailing of the mothers of Bethlehem over their murdered children was as great as the lamentation made when the people were carried into exile.

Typology rather assumes a causal connection between the two events. The destruction of the people of Israel by the Assyrians and Chaldeans is a type of the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem, in so far as the sin which brought the children of Israel into exile laid a foundation for the fact that Herod the Idumean became king over the Jews, and wished to destroy the true King and Saviour of Israel that he might strengthen his own dominion. Cf. Fr. Kleinschmidt, *die typolog. Citate der vier Evangelien*, 1861, S. 10 ff.; [Fairbairn's *Typology*, fifth edition, vol. i. pp. 452-3.]

The Lord will put an end to this wailing. "Cease thy weeping," He cries to the sorrowing ones, "for there is a reward for thy labour" (almost identical with 2 Chron. xv. 7). פָּעָלָה is the maternal labour of birth and rearing of children. The reward consists in this, that the children shall return out of the land of the enemy into their own land. Ver. 17 states the same thing in parallel clauses, to confirm the promise. On the expression "hope for thy latter end," cf. xxix. 11. without the article, as in Hos. xi. 10, etc.; cf. Ewald, § 277, b. This hope is grounded on the circumstance that Israel will become aware, through suffering, that he is punished for his sins, and, repenting of these sins, will beseech his God for favour. The Lord already perceives this repentant spirit and acknowledgment of sin. וְאָכַר does not mean "I had myself chastised," or "I learned chastisement" (Hitzig), but "I was chastised," like an untamed calf, *i.e.* one not trained to bear the yoke and to endure labour. On this figure, cf. Hos. x. 11. The recognition of suffering as chastisement by God excites a desire after amelioration and amendment. But since man cannot accomplish these through his own powers, Israel prays, "Lead me back," *sc.* from my evil way, *i.e.* turn me. He finds himself constrained to this request, because he feels regret for his apostasy from God. אַחֲרֵי שְׁפָטִי in this connection can only mean, "after I turned," *sc.* from Thee, O Lord my God; on this meaning of שָׁבַב, cf. viii. 4. הַיְרָע, to be brought to understanding through punishment, *i.e.* to become wise. To smite the thighs is a token of terror and horror; cf. Ezek. xxi. 17. On בְּשָׁפֵט וְגַם בְּכַלְמָתִי cf. Isa. xlvi. 16. "The shame of my youth" is that which I brought on myself in my youth through the

sins I then committed. On this confession generally, cf. the similar one in iii. 21 ff.—Thereafter the Lord replies, ver. 20, with the question, whether Ephraim is so dear a son to Him that, as often as He has spoken against him, *i.e.* uttered hard words of condemnation, He still, or again, thinks of him. **ילְשֹׁעַיִם**, “a child of delight,” whom one fondles; cf. Isa. v. 7. The clause explanatory of the question, “for as often as,” etc., is taken in different ways. **דִּבֶּר בָּבָר** may signify, “to speak about one,” or “to speak against one,” or “to pay addresses to one,” *i.e.* to court him: 1 Sam. xxv. 39; Cant. viii. 8. Hitzig applies the last meaning to the expression, and translates, “as often as I have paid my suit to him;” according to this view, the basis of the representation of Jahveh’s relation to the people is that of a husband to his wife. But this meaning of the verb does not by any means suit the present context, well established though it is by the passages that have been adduced. Ephraim is here represented as a son, not a virgin to whom Jahveh could pay suit. Hence we must take the expression in the sense of “speaking against” some one. But what Jahveh says against Ephraim is no mere threatening by words, but a reprimand by deeds of judgment. The answer to the question is to be inferred from the context: If the Lord, whenever He is constrained to punish Ephraim, still thinks of him, then Ephraim must be a son dear to Him. But this is not because of his conduct, as if he caused Him joy by obedience and faithful attachment, but in consequence of the unchangeable love of God, who cannot leave His son, however much grief he causes his Father. “Therefore,” *i.e.* because he is a son to whom Jahveh shows the fulness of His paternal love, all His kindly feelings towards him are now excited, and He desires to show compassion on him. On **הַמָּטַב** cf. Isa. xvi. 11 and lxiii. 15. Under “bowels” are included especially the heart, liver, reins, the noblest organs of the soul. The expression is strongly anthropopathic, and denotes the most heartfelt sympathy. This fellow-feeling manifests itself in the form of pity, and actually as deliverance from misery.

The Lord desires to execute this purpose of His everlasting love. Ver. 21. Israel is required to prepare himself for return, and to go home again into his own cities. “Set thee up way-

marks." צַיִן, in 2 Kings xxiii. 17 and Ezek. xxxix. 15, "a tomb-stone," probably a stone pillar, which could also serve as a way-mark. צָמָרֹרִים is not from צָמָר as in ver. 15, but from צָמָר, and has the same meaning as צָמָרָה, Joel iii. 3, Talm.

צָמָר, a pillar, Arab. قَبْرٌ, pl., *cippi, signa in desertis*. "Set thy heart," i.e. turn thy mind to the road, the way you have gone (on הַלְכָתִי see ii. 20), not, that you may not miss it, but because it leads thee home. "Return to these cities of thine." "These" implies that the summons issues from Palestine. Moreover, the separate clauses of this verse are merely a poetic individualization of the thought that Israel is to think seriously of returning; and, inasmuch as this return to Palestine presupposes return to the Lord, Israel must first turn with the heart to his God. Then, in ver. 22, follows the exhortation not to delay. The meaning of הַתְהַפֵּךְ is deduced from Cant. v. 6, where חַמְלָךְ signifies to turn one's self round; hence the Hithpael means to wander about here and there, uncertain what to do. This exhortation is finally enforced by the statement, "Jahveh creates a new thing on the earth" (cf. Isa. xlivi. 19). This novelty is, "a woman will encompass a man." With regard to the meaning of these words, about which there is great dispute, this much is evident from the context, that they indicate a transformation of things, a new arrangement of the relations of life. This new arrangement of things which Jahveh brings about is mentioned as a motive which should rouse Ephraim (= Israel) to return without delay to the Lord and to his cities. If we keep this in mind, we shall at once set aside as untenable such interpretations as that of Luther in his first translation of 1532-38, "those who formerly behaved like women shall be men," which Ewald has revived in his rendering, "a woman changing into a man," or that of Schnurrer, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Maurer, "the woman shall protect the man," or that of Nägelsbach, "the woman shall turn the man to herself." The above-mentioned general consideration, we repeat, is sufficient to set aside these explanations, quite apart from the fact that none of them can be lexically substantiated; for neither means to "turn one's self, *vertere*," nor to "protect," nor to "cause to return" (as if

סובב were used for שׁובב). Deut. xxxii. 10 is adduced to prove the meaning of protection; but the word there means to go about fondling and cherishing. Neither the transmutation of the female into a male, or of a weak woman into a strong man, nor the protection of the man by a woman, nor the notion that the strong succumbs to the weak, forms an effectual motive for the summons to Israel to return; nor can we call any of them a new creative act effected by Jahveh, or a new arrangement of things. But we must utterly reject the meaning of the words given by Castle, le Clerc, and Hitzig, who apply them to the unnatural circumstance, that a woman makes her suit to a man, even where by the woman is understood the virgin of Israel, and by the man, Jahveh. Luther gave the correct rendering in his editions of 1543 and 1545, "the woman shall encompass the man,"—only, "embrace" (Ger. *umfangen*) might express the sense better than "encompass" (Ger. *umgeben*). נָכְבָה is *nomen sexus*, "femella, a female;" נָכָר, a "man," also "proles mascula," not according to the sexual relation (= יָבָר), but with the idea of strength. Both in the choice of these words and by the omission of the article, the relation is set forth in its widest generality; the attention is thereby steadily directed to its fundamental nature. The woman, the weak and tender being, shall lovingly embrace the man, the strong one. Hengstenberg reverses the meaning of the words when he renders them, "the strong one shall again take the weak into his closest intercourse, under his protection, loving care." Many expositors, including Hengstenberg and Hitzig of moderns, have rightly perceived that the general idea has been set forth with special reference to the relation between the woman, Israel, and the man, Jahveh. Starting with this view, which is suggested by the context, the older expositors explained the words of the conception and birth of Christ by a virgin; cf. Corn. a Lapide, Calovii *Bibl. ill.*, Cocceius, and Pfeiffer, *dubia vex.* p. 758 sqq. Thus, for example, the Berleburger Bibel gives the following explanation: "A woman or virgin—not a married woman—will encompass, *i.e.* carry and contain in her body, the man who is to be a vanquisher of all and to surpass all in strength." This explanation cannot be set aside by the simple remark, "that here there would be set forth the very feature

in the birth of Christ by a virgin which is not peculiar to it as compared with others ;" for this "superficial remark" does not in the least touch the real point to be explained. But it may very properly be objected, that סָבַב has not the special meaning of conceiving in a mother's womb. On this ground we can also set down as incorrect the other explanation of the words in the Berleburger Bibel, that the text rather speaks of "the woman who is the Jewish Church, and who, in the spirit of faith, is to bear Christ as the mighty God, Isa. ix. 6, in the likeness of a man, Rev. xii. 1, 2." However, these explanations are nearer the truth than any that have been offered since. The general statement, "a woman shall encompass (the) man," *i.e.* lovingly embrace him,—this new relation which Jahveh will bring about in place of the old, that the man encompasses the wife, loving, providing for, protecting her,—can only be referred, agreeably to the context, to change of relation between Israel and the Lord. סָבַב, "to encompass," is used tropically, not merely of the mode of dealing on the part of the Lord to His people, the faithful,—of the protection, the grace, and the aid which He grants to the pious ones, as in Ps. xxxii. 7, 10, Deut. xxxii. 10,—but also of the dealings of men with divine things. אֶסְבָּבָה מִלְּפָנֶיךָ, Ps. xxvi. 6, does not mean, "I will go round Thine altar," in a circle or semicircle as it were, but, "I will keep to Thine altar," instead of keeping company with the wicked; or more correctly, "I will surround Thine altar," making it the object of my care, of all my dealings,—I will make mine own the favours shown to the faithful at Thine altar. In the verse now before us, סָבַב signifies to encompass with love and care, to surround lovingly and carefully,—the natural and fitting dealing on the part of the stronger to the weak and those who need assistance. And the new thing that God creates consists in this, that the woman, the weaker nature that needs help, will lovingly and solicitously surround the man, the stronger. Herein is expressed a new relation of Israel to the Lord, a reference to a new covenant which the Lord, ver. 31 ff., will conclude with His people, and in which He deals so condescendingly towards them that they can lovingly embrace Him. This is the substance of the Messianic meaning in the words. The conception of the Son of God in the womb of the

Virgin Mary is not expressed in them either directly or indirectly, even though we were allowed to take סובב in the meaning of "embrace." This new creation of the Lord is intended to be, and can be, for Israel, a powerful motive to their immediate return to their God.

Vers. 23-26. *The re-establishment and blessing of Judah.*—Ver. 23. "Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Once more shall they say this word in the land of Judah and in its cities, when I turn their captivity: 'Jahveh bless thee, O habitation of righteousness, O mountain of holiness !' Ver. 24. And there shall dwell in it, [in] Judah and all its cities together, husbandmen and [those who] move about with the flock. Ver. 25. For I have satiated the weary soul, and I have filled every languishing soul. Ver. 26. Because of this I awoke and looked, and my sleep was sweet unto me."

The prophecy which treats of Judah alone is condensed, but states much in few words,—not merely the *restitutio in statum integritatis*, but also rich blessing thereafter. "May Jahveh bless thee" is a benediction, equivalent to "may you be blessed;" cf. Ps. cxxviii. 5, cxxxiv. 3. רְצָבָנָה does not mean "habitation of salvation," but "habitation of righteousness;" cf. Isa. i. 21, where it is said of Jerusalem that righteousness formerly dwelt in it. This state of matters is again to exist; Jerusalem is again to become a city in which righteousness dwells. "The holy mountain" is Zion, including Moriah, where the Lord had set up His throne. That the designation "the holy mountain" was applied to the whole of Jerusalem cannot be made out from Ps. ii. 6, xlviii. 2 ff., Isa. xi. 9, xxvii. 13, which have been adduced to prove the assertion. The prayer for the blessing implies that Zion will again be the seat of the Divine King of His people. Ver. 24. "There dwell in it (in the land of Judah) Judah and all his towns," i.e. the population of Judah and of all its towns, as "husbandmen and (those who) pasture flocks," i.e. each one pursuing undisturbed his own peaceful employment, agriculture and cattle-rearing, and (ver. 25) so blessed in these callings that they are kept from every need and want. רְאַבָּה may either be viewed as the perfect, before which the relative is to be supplied, or an adjectival form imitated from the Aramaic parti-

ciple, masc. בָּן.—Ver. 26. Thereupon the prophet awoke from his ecstatic sleep, and said, "My sleep was pleasant" (cf. Prov. iii. 24). Very many expositors, including Rosenmüller, Umbreit, and Neumann among the moderns, understand the words, "therefore (or, because of this) I awoke," etc., as referring to God, because in what precedes and follows Jahveh speaks, and because God is sometimes, in the Psalms, called on to awake, *e.g.* Ps. vii. 7, xxxv. 23, xliv. 24, etc. But it has been very properly objected to this, that the words, "my sleep was sweet" (pleasant), are inappropriate as utterances of God, inasmuch as He does not sleep; nowhere in Scripture is sleep attributed to God, and the summons to awake merely implies the non-interference on the part of God in the affairs of His people. Moreover, we would need to refer the sleeping of God, mentioned in this verse, to His dealing towards Israel during the exile, in such a way that His conduct as a powerful judge would be compared to a sweet sleep,—which is inconceivable. As little can the verse be supposed to contain words of the people languishing in exile, as Jerome has taken them. For the people could not possibly compare the time of oppression during the exile to a pleasant sleep. There is thus nothing left for us but to take this verse, as the Targum, Raschi, Kimchi, Venema, Dahler, Hitzig, Hengstenberg, and others have done, as a remark by the prophet regarding his feelings when he received this revelation; and we must accept something like the paraphrase of Tholuck (*die Propheten*, S. 68): "Because of such glorious promises I awoke to reflect on them, and my ecstatic sleep delighted me." This view is not rendered less tenable by the objection that Jeremiah nowhere says God had revealed Himself to him in a dream, and that, in what precedes, there is not to be found any intimation that what he sets forth appeared to him as a vision. For neither is there any intimation, throughout the whole prophecy, that he received it while in a waking state. The command of God, given xxx. 2 at the first, to write in a book the words which Jahveh spoke to him, implies that the prophecy was not intended, in the first instance, to be publicly read before the people; moreover, it agrees with the assumption that he received the prophecy in a dream. But against the objection that Jeremiah never states,

in any other place, in what bodily condition he was when he received his revelations from God, and that we cannot see why he should make such an intimation here,—we may reply, with Nägelsbach, that this prophecy is the only one in the whole book which contains unmixed comfort, and that it is thus easy to explain why he could never forget that moment when, awaking after he had received it, he found he had experienced a sweet sleep. Still less weight is there in the objection of Graf, that one cannot comprehend why this remark stands here, because the description is evidently continued in what follows, while the dream must have ended here, when the prophet awoke. For this is against the assumption that the hand of the Lord immediately touched him again, and put him back into the ecstatic state. One might rather urge the consideration that the use of the word שְׁנָה, “sleep,” does not certainly prove that the prophet was in the ecstatic state, from the fact that the LXX. render ξερδόμα, in Gen. ii. 21 and xv. 2, by ἔκστασις. But wherever divine revelations were made in dreams, these of course presuppose sleep; so that the ecstatic state might also be properly called “sleep.” Jeremiah adds, “And I looked,” to signify that he had been thoroughly awakened, and, in complete self-consciousness, perceived that his sleep had been pleasant.

Vers. 27-30. *The renovation of Israel and Judah.*—Ver. 27. “Behold, days are coming, saith Jahveh, when I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with seed of men and seed of beasts. Ver. 28. And it shall be that, just as I have watched over them to pluck up and to break down, to pull down and to destroy and to hurt, so shall I watch over them to build and to plant, saith Jahveh. Ver. 29. In those days they shall no more say, ‘Fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the teeth of the children become blunt;’ Ver. 30. But each man shall die for his own iniquity: every man who eats the sour grapes, his own teeth shall become blunted.”

After announcement has been made, in what preceded, that both portions of the covenant people will be led back into their own land and re-established there, both are now combined, since they are again, at the restoration, to be united under one king, the sprout of David (cf. iii. 15, 18), and to both there is pro-

mised great blessing, both temporal and spiritual. The house of Israel and the house of Judah, as separate nations, are represented as a fruitful field, which God will sow with men and cattle. בָּהָרְכָה, "cattle," the tame domestic animals, contribute to the prosperity of a nation. That this seed will mightily increase, is evident from the fact that God sows it, and (as is further stated in ver. 28) will watch over it as it grows. Whereas, hitherto, He has watched for the purpose of destroying and annihilating the people, because of their apostasy, He will in time to come watch for the purpose of planting and building them up. The prophet has hitherto been engaged in fulfilling, against the faithless people, the first part of the commission given him by the Lord when he was called to his office (i. 10); hereafter, he will be engaged in building up. As certainly as the first has taken place,—and of this the people have had practical experience,—so certainly shall the other now take place.—Ver. 29. The proverb, which Ezekiel also (xviii. 2 f.) mentions and contends against, cannot mean, "The fathers have begun to eat sour grapes, but not till the teeth of their sons have become blunted by them" (Nägelsbach); the change of tense is against this, for, by the perfect אָכְלָה, and the imperfect תִּקְרַבְתָּה, the blunting of the children's teeth is set down as a result of the fathers' eating. The proverb means, "Children atone for the misdeeds of their fathers," or "The sins of the fathers are visited on their innocent children." On this point, cf. the explanations given on Ezek. xviii. 2 ff. "Then shall they no more say" is rightly explained by Hitzig to mean, "They shall have no more occasion to say." But the meaning of the words is not yet made plain by this; in particular, the question how we must understand ver. 30 is not settled. Graf, referring to xxiii. 7, 8, supplies יִאָמְרוּ after בַּיִתְּמָם, and thus obtains the meaning, Then will they no more accuse God of unrighteousness, as in that wicked proverb, but they will perceive that every one has to suffer for his own guilt. Hitzig and Nägelsbach have declared against this insertion,—the former with the remark that, in xxiii. 7, 8, because both members of the sentence begin with protestations, the whole is clear, while here it is not so,—the latter resting on the fact that the dropping of the proverb from current use certainly

implies a correct knowledge of the righteousness of God, but one which is very elementary and merely negative; while, on the other hand, the whole connection of the passage now before us shows that it is intended to describe a period when the theocratic life is in a most flourishing condition. Then expositors take ver. 30 as the utterance of the prophet, and as embodying the notion that the average level of morality shall be so high at this future period, that only some sins will continue to be committed, and these as isolated exceptions to the rule. Taken all in all, Israel will be a holy people, in which the general spirit pervading them will repress the evil in some individuals, that would otherwise manifest itself. But we cannot imagine how these ideas can be supposed to be contained in the words, "Every man shall die for his own sins," etc. Ver. 30 unquestionably contains the opposite of ver. 29. The proverb mentioned in ver. 29 involves the complaint against God, that in punishing sin He deals unjustly. According to this view, ver. 30 must contain the declaration that, in the future, the righteousness of God is to be revealed in the punishment of sins. As we have already remarked on *Ezek. xviii. 3 f.*, the verse in question rather means, that after the re-establishment of Israel, the Lord will make known to His people His grace in so glorious a manner that the favoured ones will fully perceive the righteousness of His judgments. The experience of the unmerited love and compassion of the Lord softens the heart so much, that the favoured one no longer doubts the righteousness of the divine punishment. Such knowledge of true blessedness cannot be called elementary; rather, it implies a deep experience of divine grace and a great advance in the life of faith. Nor does the verse contain a judgment expressed by the prophet in opposition to that of his contemporaries, but it simply declares that the opinion contained in that current proverb shall no longer be accepted then, but the favoured people will recognise in the death of the sinner the punishment due to them for their own sin. Viewed in this manner, these verses prepare the way for the following announcement concerning the nature of the new covenant.

Vers. 31-40. The new covenant.—Ver. 31. "Behold, days are coming, saith Jahveh, when I will make with the house of

Israel and with the house of Judah a new covenant ; Ver. 32. Not like the covenant that I made with their fathers on the day when I laid hold of their hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, which covenant of mine they broke, though I had married them to myself, saith Jahveh ; Ver. 33. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith Jahveh : I will put my law within them, and on their heart will I write it ; and I will become to them a God, and they shall be to me a people. Ver. 34. And they shall no more teach every man his neighbour and every man his brother, saying, Know ye Jahveh, for all of them shall know me, from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith Jahveh ; for I will pardon their iniquity, and their sins will I remember no more. Ver. 35. Thus saith Jahveh, [who] gives the sun for light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and stars for light by night, who rouses the sea so that its waves roar, Jahveh of hosts is His name : Ver. 36. If these ordinances move away from before me, saith Jahveh, then also will the seed of Israel cease to be a people before me for ever. Ver. 37. Thus saith Jahveh : If the heavens above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth below can be searched out, then will I also reject all the seed of Israel because of all that they have done, saith Jahveh. Ver. 38. Behold, days come, saith Jahveh, when the city shall be built for Jahveh, from the tower of Hananeel unto the gate of the corner, Ver. 39. And the measuring-line shall once more go out straight over the hill of Gareb, and turn round towards Goah. Ver. 40. And all the valley of the corpses and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the valley of Kidron, unto the corner of the gate of the horses towards the east, [shall be] holiness to Jahveh ; it shall not be plucked up nor pulled down again for ever."

The re-establishment of Israel reaches its completion in the making of a new covenant, according to which the law of God is written in the hearts of the people ; thereby Israel becomes in truth the people of the Lord, and the knowledge of God founded on the experience of the forgiveness of sins is such that there is no further need of any external means like mutual teaching about God (vers. 31-34). This covenant is to endure for ever, like the unchangeable ordinances of nature (vers.

35-37); and in consequence of this, Jerusalem shall be built as the holy city of God, which shall never be destroyed again (vers. 38-40).—Ver. 31. פָּרָת בְּרִית does not mean “to make an appointment,” but “to conclude a covenant,” to establish a relation of mutual duties and obligations. Every covenant which God concludes with men consists, on the side of God, in assurance of His favours and actual bestowal of them; these bind men to the keeping of the commands laid on them. The covenant which the Lord will make with all Israel in the future is called “a new covenant,” as compared with that made with the fathers at Sinai, when the people were led out of Egypt; this latter is thus implicitly called the “old covenant.” The words, “on the day when I took them by the hand,” etc., must not be restricted, on the one side, to the *day* of the exodus from Egypt, nor, on the other, to the *day* when the covenant was solemnly made at Sinai; they rather refer to the whole time of the exodus, which did not reach its termination till the entrance into Canaan, though it culminated in the solemn admission of Israel, at Sinai, as the people of Jahveh; see on vii. 22. (On the punctuation of חַזְקִיָּה, cf. Ewald, § 238, *d*, Olshaus. *Gramm.* § 191, *f.*) אֲשֶׁר is not a conjunction, “quod, because,” but a relative pronoun, and must be combined with אֶת־בְּרִיתִי, “which my covenant,” *i.e.* which covenant of mine. “They” stands emphatically in contrast with “though I” in the following circumstantial clause, which literally means, “but I have married them to myself,” or, “I was their husband.” As to בְּעָלָתִי, see on iii. 14. Hengstenberg wrongly takes the words as a promise, “but I will marry them to myself;” this view, however, is incompatible with the perfect, and the position of the words as a contrast with “they broke.”¹ The two closely connected expressions indicate why a new covenant was necessary; there is no formal statement, however, of the reason, which is merely given in a subordinate and appended clause. For the proper reason why a new covenant is made is not that the people have

¹ In the citation of this passage in Heb. viii. 8 ff., the words are quoted according to the LXX. version, καὶ γὰρ ἡμέλησον αὐτῶν, although this translation is incorrect, because the apostle does not use these words in proving any point. These same words, moreover, have been rendered by the LXX., in iii. 14, ἵγεται κατακυριεύσων ὑμᾶς.

broken the old one, but that, though Jahveh had united Israel to Himself, they have broken the covenant and thereby rendered it necessary to make a new one. God the Lord, in virtue of His unchangeable faithfulness, would not alter the relation He had Himself established in His love, but simply found it anew in a way which obviated the breaking of the covenant by Israel. For it was a defect connected with the covenant made with Israel at Sinai, that it could be broken on their part. This defect is not to exist in the new covenant which God will make in after times. The expression “after those (not *these*) days” is remarkable; **הַיּוֹם** is not the same as **הַיּוֹם**, and yet the days meant can only be the “coming days;” accordingly, it is “those days” (as in ver. 29) that are to be expected. The expression “after these days” is inexact, and probably owes its origin to the idea contained in the phrase “in the end of the days” (בְּאַחֲרִית הַיּוֹם, cf. xxiii. 20).—Ver. 33. The character of the new covenant: “I (Jahveh) give (will put) my law within them, and write it upon their heart.” **בְּקִרְבֵּם** is the opposite of **לְפָנֵיכֶם**, which is constantly used of the Sinaitic law, cf. ix. 12, Deut. iv. 8, xi. 32, 1 Kings ix. 6; and the “writing on the heart” is opposed to writing on the tables of stone, Ex. xxxi. 18, cf. xxxii. 15 f., xxxiv. 8, Deut. iv. 13, ix. 11, x. 4, etc. The difference, therefore, between the old and the new covenants consists in this, that in the old the law was laid before the people that they might accept it and follow it, receiving it into their hearts, as the copy of what God not merely required of men, but offered and vouchsafed to them for their happiness; while in the new it is put within, implanted into the heart and soul by the Spirit of God, and becomes the animating life-principle, 2 Cor. iii. 3. The law of the Lord thus forms, in the old as well as in the new covenant, the kernel and essence of the relation instituted between the Lord and His people; and the difference between the two consists merely in this, that the will of God as expressed in the law under the old covenant was presented externally to the people, while under the new covenant it is to become an internal principle of life. Now, even in the old covenant, we not only find that Israel is urged to receive the law of the Lord his God into his heart,—to make the law presented to him from without the property of

his heart, as it were,—but even Moses, we also find, promises that God will circumcise the heart of the people, that they may love God the Lord with all their heart and all their soul (Deut. xxx. 6). But this circumcision of heart and this love of God with the whole soul, which are repeatedly required in the law (Dent. vi. 5, x. 12, 16), are impossibilities, unless the law be received into the heart. It thus appears that the difference between the old and the new covenants must be reduced to this, that what was commanded and applied to the heart in the old is given in the new, and the new is but the completion of the old covenant. This is, indeed, the true relation between them, as is clearly shown by the fact, that the essential element of the new covenant, “I will be their God, and they shall be my people,” was set forth as the object of the old ; cf. Lev. xxvi. 12 with Ex. xxix. 45. Nevertheless the difference is not merely one of degree, but one of kind. The demands of the law, “Keep the commandments of your God,” “Be ye holy as the Lord your God is holy,” cannot be fulfilled by sinful man. Even when he strives most earnestly to keep the commands of the law, he cannot satisfy its requirements. The law, with its rigid demands, can only humble the sinner, and make him beseech God to blot out his sin and create in him a clean heart (Ps. li. 11 ff.) ; it can only awaken him to the perception of sin, but cannot blot it out. It is God who must forgive this, and by forgiving it, write His will on the heart. The forgiveness of sin, accordingly, is mentioned, ver. 34, at the latter part of the promise, as the basis of the new covenant. But the forgiveness of sins is a work of grace which annuls the demand of the law against men. In the old covenant, the law with its requirements is the impelling force ; in the new covenant, the grace shown in the forgiveness of sins is the aiding power by which man attains that common life with God which the law sets before him as the great problem of life. It is in this that the qualitative difference between the old and the new covenants consists. The object which both set before men for attainment is the same, but the means of attaining it are different in each. In the old covenant are found commandment and requirement ; in the new, grace and giving. Certainly, even under the old covenant, God bestowed on the people of Israel grace and the

forgiveness of sins, and, by the institution of sacrifice, had opened up a way of access by which men might approach Him and rejoice in His gracious gifts ; His Spirit, moreover, produced in the heart of the godly ones the feeling that their sins were forgiven, and that they were favoured of God. But even this institution and this working of the Holy Spirit on and in the heart, was no more than a shadow and prefiguration of what is actually offered and vouchsafed under the new covenant, Heb. x. 1. The sacrifices of the old covenant are but prefigurations of the true atoning-offering of Christ, by which the sins of the whole world are atoned for and blotted out.

In ver. 34a are unfolded the results of God's putting His law in the heart. The knowledge of the Lord will then no longer be communicated by the outward teaching of every man to his fellow, but all, small and great, will be enlightened and taught by the Spirit of God (Isa. liv. 13) to know the Lord ; cf. Joel iii. 1 f., Isa. xi. 9. These words do not imply that, under the new covenant, "the office of the teacher of religion must cease" (Hitzig) ; and as little is "disparity in the imparting of the knowledge of God silently excluded" in ver. 33. The meaning simply is this, that the knowledge of God will then no longer be dependent on the communication and instruction of man. The knowledge of Jahveh, of which the prophet speaks, is not the theoretic knowledge which is imparted and acquired by means of religious instruction ; it is rather knowledge of divine grace based upon the inward experience of the heart, which knowledge the Holy Spirit works in the heart by assuring the sinner that he has indeed been adopted as a son of God through the forgiveness of his sins. This knowledge, as being an inward experience of grace, does not exclude religious instruction, but rather tacitly implies that there is intimation given of God's desire to save and of His purpose of grace. The correct understanding of the words results from a right perception of the contrast involved in them, viz. that under the old covenant the knowledge of the Lord was connected with the mediation of priests and prophets. Just as, at Sinai, the sinful people could not endure that the Lord should address them directly, but retreated, terrified by the awful manifestation of the Lord on the mountain, and said entreatingly to Moses,

“ Speak thou with us and we will hear, but let not God speak with us, lest we die” (Ex. xx. 15); so, under the old covenant economy generally, access to the Lord was denied to individuals, and His grace was only obtained by the intervention of human mediators. This state of matters has been abolished under the new covenant, inasmuch as the favoured sinner is placed in immediate relation to God by the Holy Spirit. Heb. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 12.

In order to give good security that the promise of a new covenant would be fulfilled, the Lord, in ver. 35 f., points to the everlasting duration of the arrangements of nature, and declares that, if this order of nature were to cease, then Israel also would cease to be a people before Him; *i.e.* the continuance of Israel as the people of God shall be like the laws of nature. Thus the eternal duration of the new covenant is implicitly declared. Hengstenberg contests the common view of vers. 35 and 36, according to which the reference is to the firm, unchangeable continuance of God’s laws in nature, which everything must obey; and he is of opinion that, in ver. 35, it is merely the omnipotence of God that is spoken of, that this proves He is God and not man, and that there is thus formed a basis for the statement set forth in ver. 35, so full of comfort for the doubting covenant people, that God does not lie, that He can never repent of His covenant and His promises. But the arguments adduced for this, and against the common view, are not decisive. The expression “ stirring the sea, so that its waves roar,” certainly serves in the original passage, Isa. li. 15, from which Jeremiah has taken it, to bring the divine omnipotence into prominence; but it does not follow from this that here also it is merely the omnipotence of God that is pointed out. Although, in rousing the sea, “ no definite rule that we can perceive is observed, no uninterrupted return,” yet it is repeated according to the unchangeable ordinance of God, though not every day, like the rising and setting of the heavenly bodies. And in ver. 36, under the expression “ these ordinances” are comprehended the rousing of the sea as well as the movements of the moon and stars; further, the departure, *i.e.* the cessation, of these natural phenomena is mentioned [as impossible], to signify that Israel cannot cease to exist as a

people ; hence the emphasis laid on the immutability of these ordinances of nature. Considered in itself, the putting of the sun for a light by day, and the appointment of the moon and stars for a light by night, are works of the almighty power of God, just as the sea is roused so that its waves roar ; but, that these phenomena never cease, but always recur as long as the present world lasts, is a proof of the immutability of these works of the omnipotence of God, and it is this point alone which here receives consideration. “The ordinances of the moon and of the stars” mean the established arrangements as regards the phases of the moon, and the rising and setting of the different stars. “From being a nation before me” declares not merely the continuance of Israel as a nation, so that they shall not disappear from the earth, just as so many others perish in the course of ages, but also their continuance before Jahveh, *i.e.* as His chosen people ; cf. xxx. 20.—This positive promise regarding the continuance of Israel is confirmed by a second simile, in ver. 37, which declares the impossibility of rejection. The measurement of the heavens and the searching of the foundations, *i.e.* of the inmost depths, of the earth, is regarded as an impossibility. God will not reject *the whole* seed of Israel : here **שׁ** is to be attentively considered. As Hengstenberg correctly remarks, the hypocrites are deprived of the comfort which they could draw from these promises. Since the posterity of Israel are not all rejected, the rejection of the dead members of the people, *i.e.* unbelievers, is not thereby excluded, but included. That the whole cannot perish “is no bolster for the sin of any single person.” The prophet adds : “because of all that they have done,” *i.e.* because of their sins, their apostasy from God, in order to keep believing ones from despair on account of the greatness of their sins. On this, Calvin makes the appropriate remark : *Consulto propheta hic proponit scelera populi, ut sciamus superiorem fore Dei clementiam, nec congeriem tot malorum fore obstaculo, quominus Deus ignoscat.* If we keep before our mind these points in the promise contained in this verse, we shall not, like Graf, find in ver. 37 merely a tame repetition of what has already been said, and be inclined to take the verse as a superfluous marginal gloss.¹

¹ Hitzig even thinks that, “because the style and the use of language

Vers. 38-40. Then shall Jerusalem be built up as a holy city of God, and be no more destroyed. After יְמִים, the Masoretic text wants בָּאִים, which is supplied in the *Qeri*. Hengstenberg is of opinion that the expression was abbreviated here, inasmuch as it has already occurred before, several times, in its full form (vers. 27 and 31); but Jeremiah does not usually abbreviate when he repeats an expression, and בָּאִים has perhaps been dropped merely through an error in transcription. “The city shall be built for Jahveh,” so that it thenceforth belongs to Him, is consecrated to Him. The extent of the new city is described as being “from the tower of Hananeel to the gate of the corner.” The tower of Hananeel, according to Neh. iii. 1 and Zech iv. 10, was situated on the north-east corner of the city wall; the gate of the corner was at the north-west corner of the city, to the north or north-west of the present “Jaffa Gate;” see on 2 Kings xiv. 13, 2 Chron. xxvi. 9; cf. Zech. xiv. 10. This account thus briefly describes the whole north side. Ver. 39. The measuring-line (קַרְבָּן as found here, 1 Kings vii. 23 and Zech. i. 16, is the original form, afterwards shortened into קָרְבָּן, the *Qeri*) further goes out נִנְהָרָה, “before itself,” i.e. straight out over the hill Gareb. עַל does not mean “away towards, or on” (Hitzig); nor is the true reading עַד, “as far as, even to,” which is met with in several codices: the correct rendering is “away over,” so that a part, at least, of the hill was included within the city bounds. “And turns towards Goah.” These two places last named

betoken the second Isaiah, and the order of both strophes is reversed in the LXX. (i.e. ver. 37 stands before ver. 35 f.), vers. 35, 36 may have stood in the margin at the beginning of the genuine portion in vers. 27-34, and ver. 37, on the other hand, in the margin at ver. 34.” But, that the verses, although they present reminiscences of the second Isaiah, do not quite prove that the language is his, has already been made sufficiently evident by Graf, who points out that, in the second Isaiah, הַמָּה is nowhere used of the roaring of the sea, nor do we meet with חֲקִוָת and חֲקִים, מְסֻדָּר אָרֶץ, nor again in חַקָּר in the Niphal, or בְּלַחְיִם, יְשַׁבּוּ מִהְיוֹת (but מְסֻדָּות חַקָּר in Isa. xl. 21); other expressions are not peculiar to the second Isaiah, since they also occur in other writings.—But the transposition of the verses in the LXX., in view of the arbitrary treatment of the text of Jeremiah in that version, cannot be made to prove anything whatever.

are unknown. From the context of the passage only this much is clear, that both of them were situated on the west of the city; for the starting-point of the line spoken of is in the north-west, and the valley of Ben-hinnom joins in at the end of it, in the south, ver. 40. בְּרֵב means “itching,” for בְּרֵב in Lev. xxi. 20, xxii. 22 means “the itch;” in Arabic also “the leprosy.” From this, many expositors infer that the hill Gareb was the hill where lepers were obliged to dwell by themselves, outside the city. This supposition is probable; there is no truth, however, in the assumption of Schleussner, Krafft (*Topogr. von Jerus.* S. 158), Hitzig, and Hengstenberg, that the hill Bezetha, included within the city bounds by the third wall of Agrippa, is the one meant; for the line described in ver. 39 is not to be sought for on the north side of the city. With Graf, we look for the hill Gareb on the mount which lies westward from the valley of Ben-hinnom and at the end of the valley of Rephaim, towards the north (Josh. xv. 8, xviii. 16), so that it is likely we must consider it to be identical with “the top of the mountain” mentioned in these passages. This mountain is the rocky ridge which bounds the valley of Ben-hinnom on the west, and stretches northwards, on the west side of the valley of Gihon and the Lower Pool (*Birket es Sultân*), to near the high road to Jaffa, where it turns off towards the west on the under (*i.e.* south) side of the Upper Pool (*Birket el Mamilla*); see on Josh. xv. 8. It is not, as Thenius supposes (*Jerusalem before the Exile*, an appendix to his commentary on the Books of Kings), the bare rocky hill situated on the north, and overhanging the Upper Pool; on this view, Goah could only be the steep descent from the plateau into the valley of Kidron, opposite this hill, towards the east. Regarding Goah, only this much can be said with certainty, that the supposition, made by Vitringa and Hengstenberg, of a connection between the name and Golgotha, is untenable; lexical considerations and facts are all against it. Golgotha was situated in the north-west: Goah must be sought for south-west from Jerusalem. The translation of the Chaldee, “cattle-pond,” is a mere inference from בְּרֵב, “to bellow.” But, in spite of the uncertainty experienced in determining the positions of the hill Gareb and Goah, this much is evident from the verse before

us, that the city, which is thus to be built anew, will extend to the west beyond the space occupied by old Jerusalem, and include within it districts or spots which lay outside old (*i.e.* pre- and post-exile) Jerusalem, and which had been divided off from the city, as unclean places.—In ver. 40, without any change of construction, the southern border is described. “The whole valley of the corpses and of the ashes . . . shall be holy to Jahveh,” *i.e.* be included within the space occupied by the new city. By “the valley of the corpses and of the ashes” expositors generally and rightly understand the valley of Ben-hinnom (בְּנֵרִים) are the carcases of animals that have been killed, and of men who have been slain through some judgment of God and been left unburied). Jeremiah applies this name to the valley, because, in consequence of the pollution by Josiah of the place where the abominations had been offered to Moloch (2 Kings xxiii. 10), it had become a sort of slaughtering-place or tan-yard for the city. According to Lev. vi. 3, שְׁ�ָנָה means the ashes of the burnt-offerings consumed on the altar. According to Lev. iv. 12 and vi. 4, these were to be carried from the ash-heap near the altar, out of the city, to a clean place; but they might also be considered as the gross deposit of the sacrifices, and thus as unclean. Hence also it came to pass that all the sweepings of the temple were probably brought to this place where the ashes were, which thus became still more unclean. Instead of הַשְּׁרָמֹת, the *Qeri* requires הַשְּׁרָמֹתָה, and, in fact, the former word may not be very different from קְרָמֹת קְרָמָה, 2 Kings xxiii. 4, whither Josiah caused all the instruments used in idolatrous worship to be brought and burned. But it is improbable that שְׁרָמֹת is a mere error in transcription for קְרָמֹת. The former word is found nowhere else; not even does the verb שְׁרָם occur. The latter noun, which is quite well known, could not readily be written by mistake for the former; and even if such an error had been committed, it would not have gained admission into all the mss., so that even the LXX. should have that reading, and give the word as Ἀσαρ-ημώθ, in Greek characters. We must, then, consider שְׁרָמֹת as the correct reading, and derive the word from שְׁרָם, or

شَرْم, or صَرْم, “to cut off, cut to pieces,” in the sense of “ravines, hollows” (شَرْم), or *loca abscissa*, places cut off or shut out from the holy city. “Unto the brook of Kidron,” into which the valley of Ben-hinnom opens towards the east, “unto the corner of the horse-gate towards the east.” The horse-gate stood on the site of the modern “Dung-gate” (*Bāb el Moghāriebh*), in the wall which ran along from the south-east end of Zion to the western border of Ophel (see on Neh. iii. 28), so that, in this verse before us, it is the south and south-eastern boundaries of the city that are given; and only the length of the eastern side, which enclosed the temple area, on to the north-eastern corner, has been left without mention, because the valley of the Kidron here formed a strong boundary.

The extent of the new city, as here given, does not much surpass that of old Jerusalem. Only in the west and south are tracts to be included within the city, and such tracts, too, as had formerly been excluded from the old city, as unclean places. Jeremiah accordingly announces, not merely that there will be a considerable increase in the size of Jerusalem, but that the whole city shall be holy to the Lord, the unclean places in its vicinity shall disappear, and be transformed into hallowed places of the new city. As being sacred to the Lord, the city shall no more be destroyed.

From this description of Jerusalem which is to be built anew, so that the whole city, including the unclean places now outside of it, shall be holy, or a sanctuary of the Lord, it is very evident that this prophecy does not refer to the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the exile, but, under the figure of Jerusalem, as the centre of the kingdom of God under the Old Testament, announces the erection of a more spiritual kingdom of God in the Messianic age. The earthly Jerusalem was a holy city only in so far as the sanctuary of the Lord, the temple, had been built in it. Jeremiah makes no mention of the rebuilding of the temple, although he had prophesied the destruction, not only of the city, but also of the temple. But he represents the new city as being, in its whole extent, the sanctuary of the Lord, which the temple only had been, in

ancient Jerusalem. Cf., as a substantial parallel, Zech. xiv. 10, 11.—The erection of Jerusalem into a city, within whose walls there shall be nothing unholy, implies the vanquishment of sin, from which all impurity proceeds ; it is also the ripe fruit of the forgiveness of sins, in which the new covenant, which the Lord will make with His people in the days to come, consists and culminates. This prophecy, then, reaches on to the time when the kingdom of God shall have been perfected : it contains, under an old Testament dress, the outlines of the image of the heavenly Jerusalem, which the seer perceives at Patmos in its full glory. This image of the new Jerusalem thus forms a very suitable conclusion to this prophecy regarding the restoration of Israel, which, although it begins with the deliverance of the covenant people from their exile, is yet thoroughly Messianic. Though clothed in an Old Testament dress, it does not implicitly declare that Israel shall be brought back to their native land during the period extending from the time of Cyrus to that of Christ ; but, taking this interval as its stand-point, it combines in one view both the deliverance from the exile and the redemption by the Messiah, and not merely announces the formation of the new covenant in its beginnings, when the Christian Church was founded, but at the same time points to the completion of the kingdom of God under the new covenant, in order to show the whole extent of the salvation which the Lord will prepare for His people who return to Him. If these last verses have not made the impression on Graf's mind, that they could well have formed the original conclusion to the prophecy which precedes, the reason lies simply in the theological inability of their expositor to get to the bottom of the sacred writings.

Chap. xxxii. The Purchase of a Field as a Symbol of the Restoration of Judah after the Exile.

This chapter, after an introduction (vers. 1-5) which accurately sets forth the time and circumstances of the following event, contains, first of all (vers. 6-15), the account of the purchase of a hereditary field at Anathoth, which Jeremiah, at the divine command, executes in full legal form, together with a statement of the meaning of this purchase ; then (vers.

16-25) a prayer of the prophet for an explanation as to how the purchase of the field could be reconciled with the delivering up of the people and the city of Jerusalem to the Chaldeans ; together with (vers. 26-35) the Lord's reply, that He shall certainly give up Jerusalem to the Chaldeans, because Israel and Judah, by their sins and their idolatries, have roused His wrath ; but (vers. 36-44) that He shall also gather again His people out of all the lands whither they have been scattered, and make an everlasting covenant with them, so that they shall dwell safely and happily in the land in true fear of God.

Vers. 1-5. *The time and the circumstances of the following message from God.*—The message came to Jeremiah in the tenth year of Zedekiah, *i.e.* in the eighteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar (cf. xxv. 1 and lii. 12), when the army of the king of Babylon was besieging Jerusalem, and Jeremiah was kept in confinement in the fore-court of the royal palace. These historical data are inserted (vers. 2-5) in the form of circumstantial clauses : 'בָּזְדֵּקְיָהּ וּבָבָלְיָהּ,' "for at that time the army of the king of Babylon was besieging Jerusalem." The siege had begun in the ninth year of Zedekiah (xxxix. 1, lii. 4), and was afterwards raised for a short time, in consequence of the approach of an auxiliary corps of Egyptians ; but, as soon as these had been defeated, it was resumed (xxxvii. 5, 11). Jeremiah was then kept confined in the court of the prison of the royal palace (cf. Neh. iii. 25), "where Zedekiah, king of Judah, had imprisoned him, saying : Why dost thou prophesy, 'Thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will give this city into the hand of the king of Babylon, so that he shall take it ; Ver. 4. And Zedekiah, the king of Judah, shall not escape out of the hand of the Chaldeans, but shall assuredly be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon, and his mouth shall speak with his mouth, and his eyes shall behold his eyes ; Ver. 5. And he shall lead Zedekiah to Babylon, and there shall he be until I visit him, saith the Lord. Though ye fight with the Chaldeans, ye shall not succeed ?'"—We have already found an utterance of like import in chap. xxi., but that is not here referred to ; for it was fulfilled at the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem, and did not bring on Jeremiah the consequences mentioned here. From

chap. xxxvii. we learn that Jeremiah, during the siege of Jerusalem, on till the time when it was raised through the approach of the Egyptian army, had not been imprisoned, but went freely in and out among the people (xxxvii. 4 ff.). Not till during the temporary raising of the siege, when he wanted to go out of the city into the land of Benjamin, was he seized and thrown into a dungeon, on the pretence that he intended to go over to the Chaldeans. There he remained many days, till King Zedekiah ordered him to be brought, and questioned him privately as to the issue of the conflict; when Jeremiah replied, "Thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon." On this occasion Jeremiah complained to the king of his imprisonment, and requested that he might not be sent back into the dungeon, where he must soon perish; the king then ordered him (xxxvii. 11-24) to be taken into the court of the prison-house (*חצר הפלירה*, xxxvii. 21), where he remained in confinement till the city was taken (xxxviii. 13, 28, xxxix. 14). The statement in our verses as to the cause of this imprisonment does not contradict, but agrees with the notice in chap. xxxvii., as soon as we perceive that this account contains merely a brief passing notice of the matter. The same holds true of the utterance of the prophet in vers. 3-5. Jeremiah, even at the beginning of the siege (xxi. 3 ff.), had sent a message of similar import to the king, and repeated the same afterwards: xxxiv. 3-5, xxxvii. 17, xxxviii. 17-23. The words of our verses are taken from these repeated utterances; ver. 4 agrees almost verbatim with xxxiv. 3; and the words, "there shall he remain *עד־צקתי אותו*, till I regard him with favour," are based upon the clearer utterance as to the end of Zedekiah, xxxiv. 4, 5.—The circumstances under which Jeremiah received the following commission from the Lord are thus exactly stated, in order to show how little prospect the present of the kingdom of Judah offered for the future, which was portrayed by the purchase of the field. Not only must the kingdom of Judah inevitably succumb to the power of the Chaldeans, and its population go into exile, but even Jeremiah is imprisoned, in so hopeless a condition, that he is no longer sure of his life for a single day.

Vers. 6-15. *The purchase of the field.*—In ver. 6, the introduction, which has been interrupted by long parentheses, is

resumed with the words, “And Jeremial said,” etc. The word of the Lord follows, ver. 7. The Lord said to him: “Behold, Hanameël, the son of Shallum, thine uncle, cometh to thee, saying, ‘Buy thee my field at Anathoth, for thou hast the redemption-right to purchase it.’” According to a mode of construction common elsewhere, **דָּבָר** might be taken as in apposition to **חֶנְמַאֵל**: “Hanameël, son of Shallum, thine uncle.” But vers. 8, 9, in which Jeremiah calls Hanameël, **בָּן־דָּבָר**, son of my uncle, show that **דָּבָר** is in apposition to **שָׁלָם**: “son of Shallum, [who is] thine uncle.” The right of redemption consisted in this, that if any one was forced through circumstances to sell his landed property, the nearest blood-relation had the right, or rather was obliged, to preserve the possession for the family, either through pre-emption, or redemption from the stranger who had bought it (Lev. xxv. 25). For the land which God had given to the tribes and families of Israel for a hereditary possession could not be sold, so as to pass into the hands of strangers; and for this reason, in the year of jubilee, what had been sold since the previous jubilee reverted, without payment of any kind, to the original possessor or his heirs. (Cf. Lev. xxv. 23-28, and Keil’s *Bibl. Archäol.* ii. § 141, p. 208 ff.)—Ver. 8. What had been announced to the prophet by God took place. Hanameël came to him, and offered him his field for sale. From this Jeremiah perceived that the proposed sale was the word of the Lord, *i.e.* that the matter was appointed by the Lord. Ver. 9. Jeremiah accordingly bought the field, and weighed out to Hanameël “seven shekels and ten the silver” (**הַכְּסָף** is definite, as being the amount of money asked as price of purchase). But the form of expression is remarkable: “seven shekels and ten” instead of “seventeen” (**שְׁבָעָה וּעָשָׂר שֶׁקְלֵי הַכְּסָף**). The Chaldee consequently has “seven manehs and ten shekels of silver;” and J. D. Michaelis supposes that the seven shekels which are first named, and are separated from the ten, were shekels of gold: “seven shekels of gold, and seven shekels of silver.” But both assumptions are gratuitous, and perhaps only inferences, not merely from the unusual separation of the numerals, but likewise from the fact that seventeen silver shekels (less than two pounds sterling) was too small a price for an arable field. The sup-

position of Hitzig has more in its favour, that the mode of expression “seven shekels and ten (shekels) of silver” was a law form. Some have sought to explain the smallness of the price on the ground that the seller was compelled to part with his property through poverty, and that the land had become depreciated in consequence of the war. Both may be true; but, as Nägelsbach has already remarked, neither explains the smallness of the price. For instances have very properly been adduced from Roman history (Livy, xxvi. 11, and Florus, ii. 6) which show that occupation of a country by an enemy did not lessen the value of ground-property. It is rather to be taken into consideration, that in the first place we do not know the real value of arable land among the Hebrews; and secondly, the sale of portions of land was, correctly speaking, only the sale of the harvests up till the year of jubilee, for then the property returned to the former possessor or his heirs. In the case of a sale, then, the nearer the jubilee-year, the smaller must be the price of purchase in the alienation of the land.—Ver. 10 ff. The purchase was concluded in full legal form. “I wrote it (the necessary terms) in the letter (the usual letter of purchase), and sealed it, and took witnesses, and weighed out the money on the balance” (it was then and still is the custom in the East to weigh money). **תִּתְמַמֵּן** means here, not to append a seal instead of subscribing the name, or for attestation (cf. 1 Kings xxi. 8, Neh. x. 2), but to seal up, make sure by sealing (Isa. xxix. 11, etc.). For, from vers. 11, 12, we perceive that two copies of the bill of purchase were prepared, one sealed up, and the other open; so that, in case the open one were lost, or were accidentally or designedly injured or defaced, a perfect original might still exist in the sealed-up copy. Then “Jeremiah took the bill of purchase, the sealed one,”—the specification and the conditions,—“and the open one.” The words **הַמְצֻוֹת וְהַחֲקִים** are in apposition with **אֶחָד-סְפִר וּנו'**. The Vulgate renders *stipulationes et rata*; Jerome, *stipulatione rata*, which he explains by *stipulationibus et sponzionibus corroborata*. **מְצֻוֹת**, usually “a command, order,” is probably employed here in the general sense of “specification,” namely, the object and the price of purchase; **חֲקִים**, “statutes,” the conditions and stipulations of sale. The apposition has the meaning, “containing the agree-

ment and the conditions." Both copies of this bill, the prophet,—before the eyes of Hanameël, his cousin (חֲנָמֵאֵל), either in the general sense of a near relation, since the relationship has been stated exactly enough already, or חָנָמֵאֵל has been inadvertently omitted), and before the eyes of, *i.e.* in the presence of "the witnesses, who wrote in the letter of purchase," *i.e.* had subscribed it as witnesses in attestation of the matter, and in the eyes of all the Jews who were sitting in the court of the prison, and in whose presence the transaction had been concluded,—delivered up to his attendant Baruch, son of Nerijah, the son of Mahsejah, with the words, ver. 14: "Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Take these letters, this sealed-up letter of purchase and this open letter, and put them into an earthen vessel, that they may remain a long time [there]. Ver. 15. For thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Houses, and fields, and vineyards shall still be bought in this land."—The second utterance of the Lord (ver. 15) declares the reason why the letters were to be preserved in an earthen vessel, in order to protect them from damp, decay, and destruction, namely, because one could make use of them afterwards, when sale of property would still be taking place. There is also implied the intimation, that the present desolation of the land and the transportation of its inhabitants will only last during their time; and then the population of Judah will return, and enter again on the possession of their land. The purchase of the field on the part of Jeremiah had this meaning; and for the sake of this meaning it was announced to him by God, and completed before witnesses, in the presence of the Jews who happened to be in the court of the prison.

Vers. 16–25. *The prayer of Jeremiah.* —Although Jeremiah has declared, in the words of the Lord, ver. 14 f., the meaning of the purchase of the field to the witnesses who were present at the transaction, yet the intimation that houses, fields, and vineyards would once more be bought, seemed so improbable, in view of the impending capture and destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, that he betakes himself to the Lord in prayer, asking for further disclosures regarding the future of the people and the land, less for his own sake than for that of the people, who could with difficulty rise to such confidence of faith. The

prayer runs thus, ver. 17: "Ah, Lord Jahveh! behold, Thou hast made the heaven and the earth by Thy great power and Thine outstretched arm; to Thee nothing is impossible. Ver. 18. Thou shovest mercy unto thousands, and repayest the iniquity of fathers into the bosom of their children after them, Thou great and mighty God, whose name is Jahveh of hosts. Ver. 19. Great in counsel and mighty in deed, whose eyes are open to all the ways of the children of men, to give unto every one according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his works: Ver. 20. Thou who didst signs and wonders in the land of Egypt until this day, both in Israel and among [other] men, and madest for Thyself a name, as it is this day; Ver. 21. And didst lead Thy people Israel out of the land of Egypt with signs and wonders, and with strong hand and outstretched arm, and with great terror, Ver. 22. And didst give them this land, which Thou hast sworn to their fathers to give them, a land flowing with milk and honey; Ver. 23. And they came and took possession of it, but they hearkened not to Thy voice and walked not in Thy law: all that Thou commandedst them to do they did not, therefore didst Thou cause all this evil to come against them. Ver. 24. Behold, the besiegers' mounds are come to the city, to take it, and the city will be given into the hands of the Chaldeans, who fight against it, because of the sword, hunger, and pestilence; and what Thou didst speak is come to pass, and, behold, Thou seest it. Ver. 25. Yet Thou hast said to me, O Lord Jahveh, 'Buy thee the field for money, and take witnesses,' while the city is being delivered into the hands of the Chaldeans."

This prayer contains a laudation of the omnipotence of the Lord and the justice of His dealing among all men (vers. 17-19), and especially in the guidance of the people Israel (vers. 20-23), with the view of connecting with it the question, how the divine command to buy the field is to be reconciled with the decreed deliverance of the city into the power of the Chaldeans (vers. 24, 25). Ver. 17. God proclaims His omnipotence in the creation of the heaven and the earth, cf. xxvii. 5. From this it is plain that nothing is too wonderful for God, *i.e.* is impossible for Him, Gen. xviii. 14. As Creator and Ruler of the world, God exercises grace and justice. The words of

ver. 18 are a reminiscence and free imitation of the passages Ex. xx. 5 ff. and xxxiv. 7, where the Lord so depicts His dealings in the guidance of men. To “recompense iniquity into the bosom” (see Isa. lxv. 6, cf. Ps. lxxix. 12), *i.e.* to pour into the bosom of the garment the reward for iniquity, so that it may be carried away and borne; cf. Ruth iii. 15, Prov. xvii. 23. “The great and mighty God,” as in Deut. x. 17. On “Jahveh of hosts is His name,” cf. x. 16, xxxi. 35. **מָשֵׁ** is to be explained thus: “O Thou great God, whose name is Jahveh of hosts.”—Ver. 19. God shows His greatness and might in the wisdom with which He regards the doings of men, and in the power with which He executes His decrees, so as to recompense to every one according to his deeds. On 19a cf. Isa. xxviii. 29, Ps. lxvi. 5. “To give to every one,” etc., is repeated, word for word, from xvii. 10.—Vers. 20–22. The Lord has further shown this omnipotence and righteousness in His guidance of Israel, in His leading them out of Egypt with wonders and signs; cf. Deut. vi. 22, xxxiv. 11. “Until this day” cannot mean that the wonders continue in Egypt until this day,—still less, that their glorious remembrance continues till this day (Calvin, Rosenmüller, etc.). Just as little can we connect the words with what follows, “until this day, in Egypt and among men,” as Jerome supposed; although the idea *et in Israel et in cunctis mortalibus quotidie tua signa complentur* is in itself quite right. Logically considered, “until this day” belongs to the *verb*. **וְנִשְׁתַּחַת**, and the construction is pregnant, as in xi. 7: “Thou hast done wonders in Egypt, *and hast still been doing them* until this day in Israel and among other men.” “Men,” in contrast to “Israel,” are mankind outside of Israel,—other men, the heathen; on the expression, cf. Judg. xviii. 7, Isa. xliii. 4, Ps. lxxiii. 5. “As at this day:” cf. xi. 5, xxv. 18. Through signs and wonders the Lord wrought, leading Israel out of Egypt, and into the land of Canaan, which had been promised to their fathers. Ver. 21 is almost exactly the same as Deut. xxvi. 8, cf. iv. 34. **מִזְרָחָ פָּדוֹת** refers to the terror spread among the neighbouring nations, Ex. xv. 14 ff., by the wonders, especially the slaying of the first-born among the Egyptians, Ex. xii. 30 f., and the miracle at the Red Sea. On “a land flowing with milk and honey,” cf. Ex. iii. 8.—Ver. 23.

These wonders of grace which the Lord wrought for His people, Israel requited with base unthankfulness. When they had got into possession of the land, they did not listen to the voice of their God, and did the reverse of what He had commanded. (The *Kethib* בְּתַרְוֹת might be read as a plural. But since תְּרֹה in the plural is always written elsewhere תְּרֹות (cf. Gen. xxvi. 5, Ex. xvi. 28, xviii. 20, Lev. xxvi. 46, etc.), and the omission of the ' in plural suffixes is unusual (cf. xxxviii. 22), the word rather seems to have been incorrectly written for בְּתַרְוֹת (cf. xxvi. 4, xliv. 10, 23), *i.e.* the ' seems to have been misplaced. Therefore the Lord brought on them this great calamity, the Chaldean invasion (אַתְּקִרְבָּה for פִּקְרָה); cf. xiii. 22, Deut. xxxi. 29. With this thought, the prophet makes transition to the questions addressed to the Lord, into which the prayer glides. In ver. 24, the great calamity is more fully described. The ramparts of the besieging enemy have come to the city (בָּזָא with *acc.*), to take it, and the city is given (נָתַנְתָּה, prophetic perfect) into the hands of the Chaldeans. "Because of the sword;" *i.e.* the sword, famine, and pestilence (cf. xiv. 16, xxv. 16, etc.) bring them into the power of the enemy. "What Thou spakest," *i.e.* didst threaten through the prophets, "is come to pass; and, behold, Thou seest it (viz. what has happened), and yet (וְאַתָּה! adversative) Thou sayest to me, 'Buy the field,'" etc. The last clause, 'בְּהַעַר', is a "circumstantial" one, and is not a part of God's address, but is added by Jeremiah in order to give greater prominence to the contrast between the actual state of matters and the divine command regarding the purchase. The prayer concludes with this, which is for men an inexplicable riddle, not (as Nägelsbach thinks) for the purpose of leaving to the reader the solution of the problem, after all aids have been offered him,—for Jeremiah would not need to direct his question to God for that purpose,—but in order to ask from God an explanation regarding the future. This explanation immediately follows in the word of the Lord, which, from ver. 26 onwards, is addressed to the prophet.

Vers. 26-44. *The answer of the Lord.*—Behold, I am Jahveh, the God of all flesh; is there anything impossible to me? Ver. 28. Therefore, thus saith Jahveh: Behold, I give this city into

the hand of the Chaldeans, and into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar, the king of Babylon, that he may take it. Ver. 29. The Chaldeans that fight against this city shall come, and shall set fire to this city, and burn it and the houses on whose roofs you have burned incense to Baal and poured out libations to other gods, to provoke me. Ver. 30. For the children of Israel and the children of Judah have done only what is evil in mine eyes from their youth ; for the children of Israel have only provoked me with the work of their hands, saith Jahveh. Ver. 31. For this city has been to me [a burden] upon mine anger and upon my wrath from the day that it was built till this day, that I might remove it from before my face ; Ver. 32. Because of all the wickedness of the children of Israel and the children of Judah, which they have done, to provoke me,—they, their kings, their princes, their priests, and their prophets, the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Ver. 33. They turned to me the back and not the face ; and though they were constantly being taught, they would not hear so as to receive instruction. Ver. 34. And they placed their abominations in the house which is called by my name, in order to defile it ; Ver. 35. And built high places to Baal in the valley of Ben-hinnom, to devote their sons and their daughters to Moloch,—which I did not command them, nor did it come into my mind that they would do such abomination,—that they might lead Judah to sin. Ver. 36. And now, therefore, thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, concerning this city, of which ye say, ‘ It shall be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon, through the sword, famine, and pestilence : ’ Ver. 37. Behold, I shall gather them out of all lands whither I have driven them in my wrath, and in mine anger, and in great rage, and shall bring them back to this place, and make them dwell safely. Ver. 38. And they shall be my people, and I will be their God. Ver. 39. And I will give them one heart and one way, to fear me always, for good to them and to their children after them. Ver. 40. And I will make with them an everlasting covenant, that I shall not turn aside from doing them good ; and I will put my fear in their heart, that they may not depart from me. Ver. 41. And I shall rejoice over them, to do them good, and shall plant them in this land, in truth, with my whole heart and

my whole soul. Ver. 42. For thus saith Jahveh: 'Just as I have brought all this great evil on this people, so shall I bring on them all the good of which I speak regarding them.' Ver. 43. And fields shall be bought in this land, of which ye say, It is a desolation, without man or beast, and it is given into the hand of the Chaldeans. Ver. 44. They shall buy fields for money, and write it in the letter, and seal it up, and take witnesses, in the land of Benjamin, and in the places round Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, and in the cities of the hill-country, and in the cities of the plain, and in the cities of the south; for I shall turn again their captivity, saith Jahveh."

The Lord replies to the three points touched on in the prayer of the prophet. First, in ver. 27, He emphatically confirms the acknowledgment that to Him, as Creator of heaven and earth, nothing is impossible (ver. 17), and at the same time points out Himself as the God of all flesh, *i.e.* the God on whom depend the life and death of all men. This description of God is copied from Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, where Jahveh is called "the God of the spirits of all flesh." "All flesh" is the name given to humanity, as being frail and perishing.—Then God reaffirms that Jerusalem will be given into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar, and be burned by the Chaldeans (ver. 28 ff.), because Israel and Judah have always roused His wrath by their idolatry and rebellion against His commands (vers. 30-35). The substance of these verses has been often given before. On **הַצִּיתָה** cf. xxi. 10, xxxvii. 8; on **אֲשֶׁר קָפְרָו וְנו'** cf. xix. 13 with vii. 9, 18. The mention of the children of Israel in connection with the children of Judah is not to be understood as if the destruction of Jerusalem was partly owing to the former; but it is here made, to signify that Judah can expect no better fate than the Israelites, whose kingdom has been destroyed long before, and who have for a long time now been driven into exile. **הַיְיָ אָנָה עֲשֵׂם**, "they were only doing," *i.e.* doing nothing else than what is displeasing to the Lord. In ver. 30b "the children of Israel" is a designation of the whole covenant people. The whole sentence has reference to Deut. xxxi. 29. "The work of their hands" is not the idols, but signifies the whole conduct and actions of the people. Ver. 31. The difficult construction **עַל-אָפִי . . . חַיְתָה לִי** is most easily explained from the employment

of **לְהַנִּהּ עַל** with reference to the superincumbency of a duty or burden lying on one. "This city became to me a burden on my wrath," an object which lay upon my wrath, called it forth. No other explanation can be vindicated. The passages lii. 3 and 2 Kings xxiv. 3, 20, are of a different character, and the meaning *juxta, secundum* for **לְעַל**, after vi. 14 (Hitzig), is quite unsuitable. The words, "from the day when it was built," are not to be referred to the earliest founding of Jerusalem, but to that time when the Israelites first built it; and even in reference to this, they are not to be pressed, but to be viewed as a rhetorically strong expression for, "from its earliest times." Even so early as David's time, opposition against Jahveh showed itself in the conspiracy of Absalom; and towards the end of Solomon's reign, idolatry had been introduced into Jerusalem, 1 Kings xi. 5 ff. After the words "to remove it from before my face," there follows once more, in ver. 32, the reason of the rejection; cf. vii. 12, xi. 17, and for enumeration of the several classes of the population, ii. 26, xvii. 25. The sins are once more specified, vers. 33-35; in ver. 33, as a stiff-necked departure from God, and in ver. 34 f. the mention of the greatest abomination of idolatry, the setting up of idols in the temple, and of the worship of Moloch. With 33a cf. ii. 27. The inf. abs. **וְלֹפֶר** stands with special emphasis instead of the finite tense: though they were taught from early morn, yet they were inattentive still. On this point cf. ii. 13, 25, xxv. 3, 4. On **לְקַחַת מָסֵר** cf. xvii. 23, vii. 28. Vers. 34, 35 are almost identical with vii. 30, 31. **לְשִׁשְׁתָּה וְ** **לְעַזְלָה** does not belong to the relative clause **אֲשֶׁר לֹא וְנו'** (Nägelsbach), but is parallel to **לְהַעֲבִיר וְנו'**, continuing the main clause: "that they should commit these abominations, and thereby cause Judah to sin," i.e. bring them into sin and guilt. **הַחֲטֵא** with **א** dropped; see xix. 15.—After setting forth the sin for which Judah had drawn on herself the judgment through the Chaldeans, the Lord proclaims, ver. 36 ff., the deliverance of the people from exile, and their restoration; thus He answers the question which had been put to Him, ver. 25. **בְּעַזְלָה**, "but now," marks what follows as the antithesis to what precedes. "Therefore, thus saith Jahveh," in ver. 36, corresponds to the same words in ver. 28. Because nothing is impossible to the Lord, He shall, as God of Israel, gather again

those who have been scattered through every land, and bring them back into their own country. "To this city,"—namely, of which ye speak. The suffix of מִקְבָּצָם refers to the city, whose inhabitants are meant. Jerusalem, as the capital, represents the whole kingdom. "The dispersed" are thus, in general, the inhabitants of Judah. Hence, too, from the nature of the case, "this place" is the kingdom of Judah. On this point cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 11, 33, Hos. xi. 11.—Vers. 38, 39 are to be understood like xxxi. 33. They must in very deed become the people of the Lord, for God gives them one heart and one way [of life], to fear Him always, *i.e.* through His Spirit He renews and sanctifies them (xxxi. 33, xxiv. 7; Ezek. xi. 19). "One heart and one way," that they may all with one mind and in one way fear me, no longer wander through many wicked ways (xxvi. 3; Isa. liii. 6). רְאֵה is an infinitive, as often in Deut., *e.g.* iv. 10, from which the whole sentence has been derived, and vi. 24, to which the expression לְטוֹב לְהָם points. The everlasting covenant which the Lord wishes to conclude with them, *i.e.* the covenant-relationship which He desires to grant them, is, in fact, the new covenant, xxxi. 33 ff. Here, however, only the eternal duration of it is made prominent, in order to comfort the pious in the midst of their present sufferings. Consequently, only the idea of the מְלֵיאָה is mainly set forth: "that I shall not turn away from them, to do them good,—no more withdraw from them my gracious benefits;" but the uninterrupted bestowal of these implies also faithfulness to the Lord on the part of the people. The Lord desires to establish His redeemed people in this condition by putting His fear in their heart, namely, through His Spirit; see xxxi. 33, 34. וְשִׁשְׁתִּי, "And I shall rejoice over them, by doing them good," as was formerly the case (Deut. xxviii. 63), and is again to be, in time to come. בְּאָמָר, in truth, properly, "in faithfulness." This expression is strengthened by the addition, "with my whole heart and my whole soul."—So much for the promise of restoration and renewal of the covenant people. This promise is confirmed, vers. 42-44, by the assurance that the accomplishment of deliverance shall follow as certainly as the decree of the calamity has done; the change is similar to that in xxxi. 38. Finally, vers. 43, 44, there is the application made of this to the purchase of the

field which the prophet had been commanded to fulfil ; and the signification of this purchase is thus far determined, that after the restoration of Judah to their own land, fields shall once more be bought in full legal form : with this, the discourse returns to its starting-point, and finishes. The article is used generically in **הַשְׂדָה** ; hence, on the repetition of the thought, ver. 44, the plural **שָׂדֹת** is employed instead. The enumeration of the several regions of the kingdom, as in xvii. 26, is a rhetorical individualization for strengthening the thought. The land of Benjamin is here made prominent in relation to the field purchased by Jeremiah at Anathoth in the land of Benjamin. The final sentence **בַּיִת אָשֵׁב וְנוֹ'** also serves for further proof. The Hiphil in this expression does not mean the same as the usual **אָשַׁב** : "I turn the captivity," *i.e.* I change the adversity into prosperity. **בִּנְיָשֵׁב** expresses *restitutio in statum incolumitatis seu integritatis* more plainly than **בָּשָׁב**,—not merely the change of misfortune or misery ; but it properly means, to lead back or restore the captivity, *i.e.* to remove the condition of adversity by restoration of previous prosperity. The expression is analogous to **קָוִים** or **בְּנֵה חֲרֵבֹת**, to build or raise ruins, Isa. xliv. 26, lviii. 12, lxi. 4, and **קָוִים שִׁמְמֹת**, to raise up desolate places, Isa. lxi. 4, which does not mean to restore ruins or desolate places, but to build them up into inhabitable places (cf. Isa. lxi. 4), to remove ruins or desolations by the building and restoration of cities.

Chap. xxxiii. *Renewed Promise of the Restoration and Glorious Condition of the People of God.*

Ver. 1. While Jeremiah was still in confinement in the court of the prison belonging to the palace (see xxxii. 2), the word of the Lord came to him the second time. This word of God is attached by **שְׁנִית** to the promise of chap. xxxii. It followed, too, not long, perhaps, after the other, which it further serves to confirm.—After the command to call on Him, that He might make known to him great and hidden things (vers. 2, 3), the Lord announces that, although Jerusalem shall be destroyed by the Chaldeans, He shall yet restore it, bring back the captives of Judah and Israel, purify the city from its iniquities, and make it the glory and praise of all the people of the earth (vers.

4–9), so that in it and in the whole land joy will again prevail (vers. 10–13). Then the Lord promises the restoration of the kingdom through the righteous sprout of David,—of the priesthood, too, and sacrificial worship (vers. 14–18); He promises also the everlasting duration of these two ordinances of grace (vers. 19–22), because His covenant with the seed of Jacob and David shall be as enduring as the natural ordinance of day and night, and the laws of heaven and earth (vers. 23–26).—The promises thus fall into two parts. First, there is proclaimed the restoration of the people and kingdom to a new and glorious state of prosperity (vers. 4–13); then the re-establishment of the monarchy and the priesthood to a new and permanent condition (vers. 14–26). In the first part, the promise given in chap. xxxii. 36–44 is further carried out; in the second, the future form of the kingdom is more plainly depicted.

Vers. 2, 3. *Introduction*.—Ver. 2. “Thus saith Jahveh who makes it, Jahveh who forms it in order to establish it, Jahveh is His name: Ver. 3. Call on me and I will answer thee, and tell thee great and hidden things which thou knowest not.” The reference of the suffixes in **עָשָׂה**, **אָתָּה**, and **הִכִּינָה** is evident from the contents of the propositions: the Lord does what He says, and forms what He wants to make, in order to accomplish it, *i.e.* He completes what He has spoken and determined on. **צִיר**, *to frame*, namely, in the mind, as if to think out, just as in xviii. 11: the expression is parallel with **מִתְשַׁבֵּחַ**; in this sense also we find Isa. xlvi. 11. **הַכִּין**, *to establish, realize what has been determined on, prepare*, is also found in Isa. ix. 6, xl. 20, but more frequently in Jeremiah (x. 12, li. 12, 15), and pretty often in the Old Testament generally. On the phrase “Jahveh is His name,” cf. xxxi. 35. The idea contained in ver. 2 reminds us of similar expressions of Isaiah, as in xxii. 11, xxxvii. 26, xlvi. 11, etc.; but this similarity offers no foundation for the doubts of Movers and Hitzig regarding the genuineness of this verse. The same holds as regards ver. 3. The first proposition occurs frequently in the Psalms, *e.g.* iv. 4, xxviii. 1, xxx. 9, also in Jer. vii. 27, xi. 14; but **קָרָא** with **אֶל** is unusual in Isaiah. The words **בְּצִרוֹת לֹא יַדְעַתָּם** are certainly an imitation of **בְּצִרוֹת וְלֹא יַדְעַתָּם**, Isa. xlviii. 6; but they are modified, in the manner peculiar to Jeremiah, by the change of **בְּצִרוֹת** into **נִצְרוֹת**.

The combination נְרָלוֹת וּבָצְרוֹת is elsewhere used only of the strong cities of the Canaanites, Dent. i. 28, ix. 1, Josh. xiv. 12, cf. Num. xiii. 28; here בָצְרוֹת is transferred to things which lie beyond the limits of human power to discover, and become known to men only through divine revelation. There is no good reason for Ewald's change of בָצְרוֹת in accordance with Isa. xlvi. 6.—On the contents of these verses Hengstenberg remarks: "It may seem strange that, though in the opening part the prophet is promised a revelation of greater, unknown things, for which he is to call on God, yet the succeeding announcement contains scarcely anything remarkable or peculiar." Graf also adds the remark of Hitzig, that the command to pray, addressed to Jeremiah, cannot have the effect of keeping us from the conclusion that the verses are an addition by a later hand. Nägelsbach replies that the mode of expression presents nothing specially unlike Jeremiah, and that what is most calculated to give the impression of being unlike Jeremiah's, namely, this introduction in itself, and especially the peculiar turn of ver. 3, "Call unto me," etc., is occasioned by the prayer of the prophet, xxxii. 16–25. To this prayer the prophet had received an answer, xxxii. 36–44; but he is here admonished to approach the Lord more frequently with such a request. The God who has the power to execute as well as make decrees is quite prepared to give him an insight into His great thoughts regarding the future; and of this a proof is at once given. Thus, vers. 1–3 must be viewed as the connecting link between chap. xxxii. xxxiii. Yet these remarks are not sufficient to silence the objections set forth against the genuineness of vers. 2, 3; for the specializing title of our chapter, in ver. 1, is opposed to the close connection which Nägelsbach maintains between chap. xxxii. xxxiii. The fact that, in chap. xxxii., Jeremiah addresses the Lord in prayer for further revelation regarding the purchase of the field, as commanded, and that he receives the information he desired regarding it, gives no occasion for warning to the prophet, to betake himself more frequently to God for disclosures regarding His purposes of salvation. And Nägelsbach has quite evaded the objection that Jeremiah does not obey the injunction. Moreover, the succeeding revelation made in vers. 4–26 is not of the nature of a

“proof,” for it does not contain a single great leading feature in God’s purposes as regards the future.—Hengstenberg also points out the difficulty, “that the Scripture everywhere refuses to recognise a dead knowledge as true knowledge, and that the hope of restoration has an obstacle in the natural man, who strives to obscure and to extinguish it; that, consequently, the promise of restoration is always new, and the word of God always great and grand;” but what he adduces for the solution of the difficulty contained in the command, “Call on me, and I will show thee great and unknown things,” is insufficient for his purpose. The objection which expositors have taken to these verses has arisen from an improper application of them; the words **לְךָ יְדַעַת** have been understood as referring to the request that God should give some revelation regarding the future, or His purposes of deliverance, and **עַנְנָה** as referring to the communication of His purposes for increasing our knowledge of them. But “to call on God” rather signifies to pray to God, *i.e.* to beseech Him for protection, or help, or deliverance in time of need, cf. Ps. iii. 5, xxviii. 1, xxx. 9, lv. 17, etc.; and to “answer” is the reply of God made when He actually vouchsafes the aid sought for; cf. *e.g.* Ps. lv. 17, “I call on God, and Jahveh answers me (saves me);” Ps. iv. 2, 4, xviii. 7, xxvii. 7, etc. Consequently, also, “to make known” (**הַגְּדָה**) is no mere communication of knowledge regarding great and unknown things, no mere letting them be known, but a making known by deeds. The words **עַשֵּׂת** and **מְתַמֵּן**, ascribed to the Lord, suggest and require that the words should be thus understood. With the incorrect reference of these words to knowing and making known there is connected the further error, that the command, “Call unto me,” is directed to the person of the prophet, and gives an admonition for his behaviour towards God, for which the text affords no foundation whatever; for it does not run: “Thus saith Jahveh to me” (**לֵאמֹר**), and the insertion of this **לֵאמֹר** is unwarranted, and inconsistent with the use of **כִּי** which introduces the announcement. Hitzig, Graf, and others have passed by this **כִּי** without remark; and what Nägelsbach says about it is connected with his view, already refuted, as to the essential unity of chap. xxxii. xxxiii. Lastly, Ewald has enclosed ver. 3 within parentheses, and considers that

the introductory formula of ver. 2 is resumed in ver. 4: "Yea, thus saith Jahveh." This is a conclusion hastily formed by one who is in difficulty, for ver. 3 has not the nature of a parenthesis. If we allow the arbitrary addition "to me" after the words, "Thus saith the Lord," ver. 2, and if we take the words in their simplest sense,—the invocation of the Lord as a call to God for help in need,—then vers. 2, 3 do not contain a mere prelude to the revelation which follows, but an exhortation to the people to betake themselves to the Lord their God in their calamity, when He will make known to them things unattainable by human discernment; for (々, ver. 4) He announces, in reference to the ruined houses of the city, that He will repair their injuries.

Vers. 4-13. *Repair of the injuries and renewal of the prosperity of Jerusalem and Judah.*—Ver. 4. "For thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, concerning the houses of this city, and concerning the houses of the kings of Judah, which are broken down because of the besiegers' mounds and because of the sword, Ver. 5. While they come to fight with the Chaldeans, and to fill them with the corpses of men, whom I have slain in my wrath and in my fury, and for all whose wickedness I have hidden my face from this city: Ver. 6. Behold, I will apply a bandage to it and a remedy, and will heal them, and will reveal to them abundance of peace and truth. Ver. 7. And I will turn again the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel, and will build them up as at the first. Ver. 8. And I will purify them from all their iniquity by which they have sinned against me, and will pardon all their iniquities, by which they have sinned and have transgressed against me. Ver. 9. And it (the city) shall become to me a name of joy, a praise, and an honour among all the people of the earth that shall hear all the good which I do them, and shall tremble and quake because of all the good and because of all the prosperity that I show to it. Ver. 10. Thus saith Jahveh: Again shall there be heard in this place,—of which ye say, 'It is desolate, without man and without beast,'—in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem, which are laid waste, without men, and without inhabitants, and without beasts, Ver. 11. The voice of gladness and the voice of joy, the voice of the bridegroom

and the voice of the bride, the voice of those who say, ‘Praise Jahveh of hosts, for Jahveh is good, for His mercy is for ever, who bring thank-offerings into the house of Jahveh. For I will turn again the captivity of the land, as in the beginning, saith Jahveh. Ver. 12. Thus saith Jahveh of hosts: In this place, which is laid waste, without man and beast, and in all its cities, there will yet be pasture-ground for shepherds making their flocks lie down in. Ver. 13. In the cities of the hill-country, in the cities of the plain, and in the cities of the south, in the land of Benjamin, and in the environs of Jerusalem, and in the cities of Judah, the flock shall yet pass under the hand of one who counts them, saith Jahveh.’

With ver. 4 begins the statement concerning the great and incomprehensible things which the Lord will make known to His people; it is introduced by י, which marks the ground or reason,—so far as the mere statement of these things gives reason for the promise of them. The word of the Lord does not follow till ver. 6 and onwards. In vers. 4 and 5 are mentioned those whom the word concerns,—the houses of Jerusalem (ver. 4), and the people that defend the city (ver. 5). Corresponding to this order, there comes first the promise to the city (ver. 6), and then to the people. Along with the houses of the city are specially named also the houses of the kings of Judah; not, perhaps, as Hitzig thinks, because these, being built of stone, afforded a more suitable material for the declared object,—for that these alone were built of stone is an unfounded supposition,—but in order to show that no house or palace is spared to defend the city. “Which are broken down” refers to the houses, not only of the kings, but also of the city. They are broken, pulled down, according to Isa. xxii. 10, in order to fortify the walls of the city against the attacks of the enemy, partly to strengthen them, partly to repair the damage caused by the battering-rams directed against them. This gives the following meaning to the expression אֶל־הַפְּלִלּוֹת וְאֶל־הַחֶרֶב: in order to work against the mounds, *i.e.* the earthworks erected by the enemy, and against the sword. The sword is named as being the chief weapon, instead of all the instruments of war which the enemy employs for reducing the city; cf. Ezek. xxvi. 9. It is against the laws of grammar to understand נַחֲשִׁים

as referring to the destruction of the enemy by the siege material; for, on such a supposition, אלְ would require to designate the efficient cause, *i.e.* to stand for מִפְנִי (cf. iv. 26), but neither אלְ nor לְ can mean this.—The first half of ver. 5 is difficult, especially בְּאַיִם, which the LXX. have omitted, and which Movers and Hitzig would expunge, with the absurd remark, that it has come here from xxxi. 38; this is an easy and frivolous method of setting aside difficulties. All other ancient translations have read בְּאַיִם, and have attempted to point out how its genuineness is ascertained on critical grounds.¹ To connect בְּאַיִם closely with what precedes is impossible; and to understand it as referring to the houses, *quæ dirutæ adhibentur ad dimicandum cum Chaldaëis* (C. B. Michaelis), is incompatible with the idea contained in בָּזָה. Still more inadmissible is the view of L. de Dieu, Venema, Schnurrer, Dahler, and Rosenmüller: *venientibus ad oppugnandum cum Chaldaëis*; according to this view, אַתְּדָבְשָׂדִים must be the nominative or subject to בְּאַיִם. בָּזָה can only signify, “to contend with the Chaldeans” (against them); cf. xxxii. 5. According to this view, only the Jews can be the subject of בְּאַיִם. “They come to make war with the Chaldeans, and to fill them (the houses) with the dead bodies of men, whom I (the Lord) slay in my wrath.” The subject is not named, since it is evident from the whole scope of the sentence what is meant. We take the verse as a predication regarding the issue of the conflict,—but without a copula; or, as a statement added parenthetically, so that the participle may be rendered, “while they come,” or, “get ready, to fight.” בָּזָה, used of the approach of an enemy (cf. Dan. i. 1), is here employed with regard to the advance of the Jews to battle

¹ The different attempts to solve the difficulty by conjectures are of such a nature as scarcely to deserve mention. Ewald would change הַחֲרִיב: בְּאַיִם into הַחֲרִיב, “that are broken down opposite the earthworks and the cannons.” But the plural of חֲרֵב is חֲרָבֹת, Ezek. xxvi. 29, and cannot possibly mean *cannons*. E. Meier would read הַחֲרִיב בְּאַיִם, “and for the destruction of those who are pressing in.” Then must be the enemy who are pressing in; but how does this agree with what follows, “in order to fight with the Chaldeans”? Lastly, Nägelsbach would change אַתְּדָבְשָׂדִים into הַבְּשָׂדִים, to obtain the idea that the earthworks and the sword come for the purpose of contending against Jerusalem (!).

against the besiegers of the city. The second infinitival clause, “to fill them,” represents the issue of the struggle as contemplated by the Jews, in order to express most strongly its utter fruitlessness; while the relative clauses, “whom I have slain,” etc., bring out the reasons for the evil consequences. Substantially, the statement in ver. 5 is parallel to that in ver. 4, so that we might supply the preposition **עַל** (על): “and concerning those who come to fight,” etc. Through the attachment of this second predication to the first by means of the participle, the expression has become obscured. In the last clause, **שָׁרַעַתֶּם** is to be connected with **עַל־רְעִתָּם**.

In view of the destruction of Jerusalem now beginning, the Lord promises, ver. 6, “I will apply to it (the city) a bandage (see xxx. 17) and a remedy,” i.e. a bandage which brings healing, “and heal them” (the inhabitants); for, although the suffix in **רְפָאָתִים** might be referred to the houses, yet the following clause shows that it points to the inhabitants. Hitzig takes **גָּלַתִּי** in the meaning of **גָּלַל**, “I roll to them like a stream,” and appeals to Am. v. 24, Isa. xlvi. 18, lxvi. 12, where the fulness of prosperity is compared to a stream, and the waves of the sea; but this use of **גָּלַל** is as uncertain here as in xi. 20. We keep, then, to the well-established sense of revealing, making known (cf. Ps. xcvi. 2, where it is parallel with **עָזִיר**), without any reference to the figure of sealed treasure-chambers (Deut. xxviii. 12), but with the accessory notion of the unfolding of the prosperity before all nations (ver. 9), as in Ps. xcvi. 2. **עַתְּהָת** is here to be taken as a noun, “fulness, wealth,” from **עַתָּה**, an Aramaizing form for **עַשֵּׂר**, to be rich (Ezek. xxxv. 13). **שָׁלֹום וְאַמְתָּה** does not mean “prosperity and stability,” but “peace and truth;” but this is not to be toned down to “true peace,” i.e. real, enduring happiness (Nägelsbach). **אַמְתָּה** is the truth of God, i.e. His faithfulness in His promises and covenants, as in Ps. lxxxv. 11, 12, where mercy and truth, righteousness and peace, are specified as the gracious benefits with which the Lord blesses His people.—Ver. 7. The attainment of this prosperity consists in the change of the wretchedness and misery of Judah and Israel (the whole covenant people) into permanent happiness, and their being built up,—i.e. the firm establishment of their civil prosperity through the secure possession

and enjoyment of the good things of the land,—as in the beginning, *i.e.* the time previous to the rending of the state through the falling away of the people into idolatry; cf. Isa. i. 26, 1 Kings xiii. 6. For **הַשִּׁבְתָּה אַתְּ** see xxxii. 44.—Ver. 8. This prosperity gains stability and permanence through the people's being cleansed from their sins by their being forgiven, which, according to xxxi. 34, will form the basis of the new covenant. Regarding the anomalous form **לְכָלָה** for **לְכָלָיְהָ**, Hitzig supposes that in the *scriptio continua* a transcriber wished to keep the two datives **לְךָ** **לְעָנוֹתֶיךָ** separate by inserting the **ו**. But the form **כָּלָם**, xxxi. 34, is equally irregular, except that there the insertion of the **ו** may be explained in this, or in some similar way.—Ver. 9. In consequence of the renovation of Israel externally and internally, Jerusalem will become to the Lord a name of delight, *i.e.* a name which affords joy, delight. **שֵׁם** here signifies, not fame, but a name. But the name, as always in Scripture, is the expression of the essential nature; the meaning therefore is, “she will develope into a city over which men will rejoice, whenever her name is mentioned.” On the following words, “for praise and for glory,” *i.e.* for a subject of praise, etc., cf. xiii. 11. **לְכָלָיְהָ**, “to all,” or “among all nations.” How far Jerusalem becomes such is shown by the succeeding clauses: “who shall hear . . . and tremble and quake because of the good,” *i.e.* not from fear “because they are seized with terror through these proofs of the wonderful power of God in contrast with the helplessness of their idols, and through the feeling of their miserable and destitute condition as contrasted with the happiness and prosperity of the people of Israel” (Graf). Against this usual view of the words, it has already been remarked in the Berleburger Bible, that it does not agree with what precedes, viz. with the statement that Jerusalem shall become a name of joy to all nations. Moreover, **פִּחרָה** and **רִנְחָה**, in the sense of fear and terror, are construed with **מִפְנֵי** or **מִן**; here, they signify to shake and tremble for joy, like **פִּחרָה** in Isa. lx. 5, cf. Hos. iii. 5, *i.e.*, as it is expressed in the Berleburger Bible, “not with a slavish fear, but with the filial fear of penitents, which will also draw and drive them to the reconciled God in Christ, with holy fear and trembling.” Calvin had previously recognised this Messianic

idea, and fitly elucidated the words thus : *hæc duo inter se conjuncta, nempe pavor et tremor, qui nos humiliet coram Deo, et fiducia quæ nos erigat, ut audeamus familiariter ad ipsum accedere.* מִתְּנִתָּם may be for מִתְּנָתָן, cf. i. 16; but probably עֲשֵׂה is construed with a double accusative, as in Isa. xlvi. 16.

The prosperity which the Lord designs to procure for His people is, vers. 10-13, further described in two strophes (vers. 10-11 and 12-13); in vers. 10, 11, the joyous life of men. In the land now laid waste, gladness and joy shall once more prevail, and God will be praised for this. The description, “it is desolate,” etc., does not imply the burning of Jerusalem, lii. 12 ff., but only the desolation which began about the end of the siege. “In this place” means “in this land;” this is apparent from the more detailed statement, “in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem.” “The voice of gladness,” etc., forms the subject of the verb עֲשֵׂה. On the expression see vii. 34, xvi. 9, xxv. 10. There is here added: “the voice of those who say, ‘Praise the Lord,’ ” etc.—the usual liturgic formula in thanksgiving to God; cf. 2 Chron. v. 13, vii. 3, Ezra iii. 11, Ps. civi. 1. תָּהֹדָה, praise and thanks in word and deed; see xvii. 26. On אֲשֵׁב אֶת־שְׁבָתוֹ see xxxii. 44. The rendering, “I shall bring back the captives of the land” (here as in ver. 7), is both grammatically indefensible, and further, unsuitable: (a) inappropriate, on account of בְּבָרָא שָׁנָה, for no previous restoration of captives had taken place; the leading of the people out of Egypt is never represented as a bringing back from captivity. And (b) it is grammatically untenable, because restoration to Canaan is expressed either by אֶל־הַבָּא, after Deut. xxx. 5; or by בְּשִׁבָּה, with the mention of the place (אֶל־הַדְּבָרִים); cf. Jer. xvi. 15, xxiv. 6, xxxii. 37, etc.—Vers. 12, 13. In the land which is now laid waste, and emptied of men and beasts, shepherds, with their flocks, shall again move about and lie down. “This place” is specified by the mention of the several parts of the land, as in xxxii. 44, xvii. 26. עַל־יָדֵי מִנְחָה, at the hands, i.e. under the guidance, of him who counts them, viz. the shepherd, who counted the sheep when he took them out to the pasture as well as when he brought them back into the fold; cf. Virgil, *Ecl.* iii. 34.

Vers. 14-26. *The re-establishment of the Davidic monarchy*

and of the Levitical priesthood.—Ver. 14. “Behold, days are coming, saith Jahveh, when I will perform the good word which I have spoken to the house of Israel, and concerning the house of Judah. Ver. 15. In those days and at that time will I cause to sprout unto David a sprout of righteousness, and he shall do judgment and righteousness in the land. Ver. 16. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is how she shall be called, ‘Jahveh our righteousness.’ Ver. 17. For thus saith Jahveh: David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel. Ver. 18. Nor shall the Levitical priests want a man before me to offer a burnt-offering, to burn a meat-offering, or to perform sacrifice every day.

Ver. 19. “And the word of Jahveh came unto Jeremiah, saying: Ver. 20. Thus saith Jahveh, If ye shall be able to break my covenant (with) the day and my covenant (with) the night, so that there shall not be day and night in their proper time, Ver. 21. Then also shall my covenant with David my servant be broken, so that he shall not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the Levites, the priests, my ministers. Ver. 22. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, nor the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant, and the Levites who serve me.

Ver. 23. “And the word of Jahveh came to Jeremiah, saying: Ver. 24. Hast thou not seen what this people have spoken, saying, ‘The two families which the Lord hath chosen, these He hath rejected?’ and my people they have despised, so that they are no longer a nation before them. Ver. 25. Thus saith Jahveh: If my covenant with day and night doth not exist, if I have not appointed the laws of heaven and earth, Ver. 26. Then also will I reject the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so as not to take any of his seed as rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. For I will turn their captivity, and take pity on them.”

Vers. 14–18 contain the promise of the restoration of the monarchy and the priesthood. Vers. 19–26 further present two special messages from God, in the form of supplements, which guarantee the eternal continuance of these institutions.¹

¹ The portion contained within vers. 14–26 is wanting in the LXX.; for

The promise in vers. 14-16 has already been given in substance in chap. xxiii. 5, 6, and in our verses it is only formally extended, and thereby made more prominent. In ver. 14 it is designated as the establishment, *i.e.* the realization, of the good word which the Lord has spoken concerning Israel and Judah. "The good word" is, according to Deut. xxviii. 1-14, the blessing which the Lord has promised to His people if they obey His commands; cf. 1 Kings viii. 56. Here also must "the good word" be taken in the same general meaning; for our verse forms the transition from the promise of the restoration and blessing of Israel in the future (vers. 6-13) to the special promise of the renewal and completion of the Davidic monarchy (ver. 15 ff.). In xxix. 10, on the contrary, "the good word" is specially referred, by the following infinitival clause, to the deliverance of the people from Babylon. But it is unlikely that "the good word" refers to the "sprout" of David, which is expressly promised in xxiii. 5 ff., and repeated here, ver. 15 f.; for here a like promise to the Levites follows, while there is none in chap. xxiii., and it is here so closely linked with the promise regarding David, that it must be viewed as a portion of the "good word." In the change from \aleph to \aleph in ver. 14, we must not, with Hengstenberg, seek a real difference; for in Jeremiah these prepositions often interchange without any difference of meaning, as in xi. 2, xviii. 11, xxiii. 35, etc. The blessing promised to the people in the "good word" culminates in the promise, ver. 15 f., that the Lord will cause a righteous sprout to spring up for David. On the meaning of this promise, see the remarks on xxiii. 5, 6. The difference made in the repeti-

this reason, and chiefly because of the promise of the eternal duration, not merely of the royal house of David, but also of the Levitical priests, and their innumerable increase, J. D. Michaelis and Jahn have considered it spurious. To these must be added Movers, who takes vers. 18, 21b-25 as later interpolations, and Hitzig, who treats the whole passage as a series of separate additions made in a later age. On the other side, Kueper, Wichelhaus, and Hengstenberg (*Christology*, vol. ii. pp. 459-461 of Clark's Translation) have shown the utter worthlessness of these reasons, and Graf also has defended the genuineness of the passage. So too has Ewald, who says (*Propheten*, ii. 269), "Nothing can be so preposterous and unreasonable as to find in this passage, xxxiii. 19-26, or in chap. xxx.-xxxiii. generally, additions by a later prophet."

tion of that promise is really unimportant. **אָצַמֵּת** instead of **הָקִמֵּת** does not change the sense. **הָצַמֵּת**, to cause to sprout or grow, corresponds to the figure of the **צַמְחָ**, under which the Messiah is represented in both passages. **צַמְחָ צִדְקָה** is only a more sonorous expression for **צַמְחָ צִדְיקָ**. The words “He shall rule as king and deal wisely,” which in xxiii. 5 bring into prominence the contrast between the kingdom of the Messiah and that of the godless shepherd of the people, were unnecessary for the connection of our passage. Besides, in xxiii. 6 Israel is named together with Judah, instead of which, we have here, in ver. 16, Jerusalem; accordingly, the name “*Jahveh Tsidkenu*” is referred to Jerusalem, while in xxiii. 6 it is predicated of the sprout of David. The mention of Jerusalem instead of Israel is connected with the general scope of our prophecy, viz. to comfort the covenant people over the destruction of Jerusalem (ver. 4 f.). But that, through the mention simply of Judah and its capital, the ten tribes are not to be excluded from participation in the coming prosperity, may be seen even from ver. 14, where “the good word” is referred to Israel and Judah, and still more plainly from vers. 24, 26, where this promise is made sure to the whole seed of Israel. The transference of the name *Jahveh Tsidkenu* from the sprout of David to the city of Jerusalem is connected with the fact, that the name only expresses what the Messiah will bring to the people (see xxiii. 6); the righteousness which He works in and on Jerusalem may, without changing the substance of the thought, be attributed to Jerusalem itself, inasmuch as Jerusalem reflects the righteousness which is bestowed on her by the Messiah.—This promise is, ver. 17, further confirmed by the renewal of that which the Lord had given King David, through Nathan the prophet, 2 Sam. vii. 12–16, and that, too, in the form in which David himself had expressed it in his address to Solomon, shortly before his death, 1 Kings ii. 4, and in which Solomon had repeated it, 1 Kings viii. 25 and ix. 5. The formula **לֹא יִכְרַת וְנוּ**, “there never will be cut off from David one sitting,” etc., has the meaning, David will never want a descendant to occupy his throne; or, the posterity of David will possess the kingdom for ever. A temporary loss of the throne is not thereby excluded, but only such a permanent loss as

would be caused by the family of David becoming extinct, or by the kingdom in Israel either passing over to some other family, or in some way or other coming to an end; see on 1 Kings ii. 4.—The very same promise is given to the Levitical priests, *i.e.* the priests of the tribe or family of Levi (פָהָנִים הַלְּבִנִים as in Deut. xvii. 9, 18, xviii. 1, etc.). They shall never want one to bring and prepare an offering before the Lord. Burnt-offering, meat-offering, and sin-offering are the three species of sacrifice which were to be brought, according to the law, as in xvii. 26. By means of the apposition “the Levites,” the priests are designated as the legitimate priesthood, established as such in virtue of God’s choice of the tribe of Levi, in contrast with priests such as Jeroboam appointed, out of the common people, for the worship set up by him. Not only shall Israel have priests, but priests out of the tribe of Levi, which was chosen by God for the sacerdotal office, as the medium of communicating His gracious gifts. The designation of the priests as “the Levites” corresponds, accordingly, to the kings of the family of David. Such a view explains this addition to our passage, to which critics such as Hitzig have taken objection. The Davidic kingdom and the Levitical priesthood were the two pillars and bases of the Old Testament theocracy, on which its existence and continuance depended. The priesthood formed the medium of approach for the people into divine favour. The kingdom assured them of the divine guidance.¹ Both of these pillars were broken with the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple; the theocracy then appeared to have ceased to exist. At this time, when the kingdom, with its ordinances of justice and of grace, bestowed by God, was being dissolved, the Lord, in order to keep His people from despair, declares that these two institutions, in accordance with His promise, shall not fall to the ground, but shall stand for ever. By this, God’s own people received a pledge for the re-establishment and renovation of the kingdom of God. Such is the object of this promise.—As to the kind and mode of reinsti-

¹ *Continebatur autem salus populi duabus istis partibus. Nam, sine rege, erant veluti corpus truncum aut mutilum; sine sacerdote mera erat dissipatio. Nam sacerdos erat quasi medius inter Deum et populum, rex autem representabat Dei personam.*—CALVIN.

ution of both of these ordinances, which were abolished when the state came to ruin, the prophecy now before us gives no explanation; but in the emphatic confirmation of the prophecy which follows, we find brief indications which clearly show that the restoration spoken of will not be a reinstitution of the old form which is now perishing, but a renovation of it, in its essential features, to a permanent existence.

The confirmations of these promises, which follow them in vers. 19-26, are each introduced by separate headings, perhaps not merely to render them more prominent, but because the Lord revealed them separately to the prophet; but it by no means follows from this that they are later additions, without any connection. Ver. 20 f. "If ye shall break my covenant with the day, . . . then also will my covenant with David . . . be broken." This *if* betokens the impossible; man cannot alter the arrangement in nature for the regular alternation of day and night. **הַיּוֹם** and **הַלִּילָה** are in apposition to **בְּרִיתִי**, "my covenant the day—the night," for "my covenant with regard to the day and the night, which is this, that day and night shall return at their appointed times." The **ו** before **לְבָلָם** is explanatory. **יּוֹם-לְלִילָה** are adverbs, "day and night," for "the regular alternation of day and night." These divine arrangements in nature are called a *covenant*; because God, after the flood, gave a pledge that they should uninterruptedly continue, in a covenant made with the human race; cf. Gen. ix. 9 with viii. 22. As this covenant of nature cannot be broken by men, so also the covenant of grace of the Lord with David and the Levites cannot be broken, *i.e.* annulled. The covenant with David consisted in the promise that his kingdom should endure for ever (see ver. 17); that with the Levites, in the eternal possession of the right to the priesthood. The institution of the priesthood is certainly not represented in the law as a covenant; it consisted merely in the choice of Aaron and his sons as priests by God, Ex. xxviii. 1. But, inasmuch as they were thereby brought into a peculiar relation to the Lord, and thus had vouchsafed to them not merely privileges and promises, but also had laid on them duties, the fulfilment of which was a condition of receiving the privileges, this relation might be called a covenant; and indeed, in Num. xxv. 11 ff., the promise

given to Phinehas, that he should have the priesthood as an eternal possession, is called a covenant of peace and an eternal covenant of priesthood. This promise concerned the whole priesthood in the person of Phinehas, and the Levites also, inasmuch as the Levites were given to the priests; hence there is mention made in Mal. ii. 4, 8, of a covenant with Levi. In this prophecy, too, mention is made of the priests alone. The general idea contained in the words "the Levites," placed first, is more clearly defined by the apposition "the priests," and restricted to the priests of the tribe of Levi.—Ver. 22. In order to make still more impressive the pledge given, that the covenant with David and the Levitical priesthood can never be broken, the Lord adds the promise of a numerous increase of the seed of David and the Levites. **אֲשֶׁר** as correlative to **כֵּן** stands for **כִּי**; for in the accusative lies the general reference to place, time, kind, and manner; cf. Ew. § 360a, 333a. The comparison with the innumerable host of stars and the immeasurable quantity of the sand reminds us of the patriarchal promises, Gen. xv. 5, xxii. 17. In this way, the promises that apply to all Israel are specially referred to the family of David and the Levites ("the Levites," ver. 22, is abbreviated from "the Levites, the priests," ver. 21). This transference, however, is not a mere hyperbole which misses the mark; for, as Jahn observes, an immense increase of the royal and priestly families would only have been a burden on the people (Graf). The import of the words of the verse is simply that the Lord purposed to fulfil the promise of His blessing, made to the patriarchs in favour of their whole posterity, in the shape of a numerous increase; but this promise will now be specially applied to the posterity of David and to the priests, so that there shall never be wanting descendants of David to occupy the throne, nor Levites to perform the service of the Lord. The question is not about a "change of the whole of Israel into the family of David and the tribe of Levi" (Hengstenberg); and if the increase of the family of David and the Levites correspond in multitude with the number of all the people of Israel, this increase cannot be a burden on the people. But the question, whether this promise is to be understood literally, of the increase of the ordinary descendants of David and the

Levites, or spiritually, of their spiritual posterity, cannot be decided, as Hengstenberg and Nägelsbach think, by referring to the words of the Lord in Ex. xix. 6, that all Israel shall be a kingdom of priests, and to the prophetic passages, Isa. lxi. 6, lxvi. 23 ff., according to which the whole people shall be priests to God, while Levites also shall be taken from among the heathen. For this prophecy does not treat of the final glory of the people of God, but only of the innumerable increase of those who shall attain membership in the family of David and the Levitical priests. The question that has been raised is rather to be decided in accordance with the general promises regarding the increase of Israel; and in conformity with these, we answer that it will not result from the countless increase of the descendants of Jacob according to the flesh, but from the incorporation, among the people of God, of the heathen who return to the God of Israel. As the God-fearing among the heathen will be raised, for their piety, to be the children of Abraham, and according to the promise, Isa. lxvi. 20 ff., even Levitical priests taken from among them, so shall the increase placed in prospect before the descendants of David and Levi be realized by the reception of the heathen into the royal and sacerdotal privileges of the people of God under the new covenant.

This view of our verse is confirmed by the additional proof given of the promised restoration of Israel, vers. 23-26; for here there is assurance given to the seed of Jacob and David, and therefore to all Israel, that they shall be kept as the people of God. The occasion of this renewed confirmation was the allegation by the people, that the Lord had rejected the two families, *i.e.* Israel and Judah (cf. xxxi. 27, 31, xxxii. 20), called, Isa. viii. 14, the two houses of Israel. With such words they despised the people of the Lord, as being no longer a people before them, *i.e.* in their eyes, in their opinion. That those who spoke thus were Jews, who, on the fall of the kingdom of Judah, despaired of the continuance of God's election of Israel, is so very evident, that Hengstenberg may well find it difficult to understand how several modern commentators could think of heathens,—Egyptians (Schnurrer), Chaldeans (Jahn), Samaritans (Movers), or neighbours of the Jews and

of Ezekiel on the Chebar (Hitzig). The verdict pronounced on what these people said, "they despise, or contemn, my people," at once relieves us from any need for making such assumptions, as soon as we assign the full and proper force to the expression "my people" = the people of Jahveh. Just as in this passage, so too in xxix. 32, "this people" is interchanged with "my people" as a designation of the Jews. Moreover, as Graf correctly says, the expression "this people" nowhere occurs in the prophets of the exile as applied to the heathen; on the contrary, it is very frequently employed by Jeremiah to designate the people of Judah in their estrangement from the Lord: iv. 10, v. 14, 23, vi. 19, vii. 33, viii. 5, ix. 14, xiii. 10, xiv. 10, xv. 1, 20, and often elsewhere. "My people," on the other hand, marks Judah and Israel as the people of God. In contrast with such contempt of the people of God, the Lord announces, "If my covenant with day and night does not stand, if I have not appointed the laws of heaven and earth, then neither shall I cast away the seed of Jacob." The נָלַד is repeated a second time before the verb. Others take the two antecedent clauses as one: "If I have not made my covenant with day and night, the laws of heaven and earth." This construction also is possible; the sense remains unchanged. בְּרִיתִי יְזָםֵן וְלִילָתִי is imitated from ver. 20. "The laws of heaven and earth" are the whole order of nature; cf. xxxi. 35. The establishment, institution of the order of nature, is a work of divine omnipotence. This omnipotence has founded the covenant of grace with Israel, and pledged its continuance, despite the present destruction of the kingdom of Judah and the temporary rejection of the guilty people. But this covenant of grace includes not merely the choosing of David, but also the choosing of the seed of Jacob, the people of Israel, on the ground of which David was chosen to be the ruler over Israel. Israel will therefore continue to exist, and that, too, as a nation which will have rulers out of the seed of David, the servant of the Lord. "The mention of the three patriarchs recalls to mind the whole series of the promises made to them" (Hengstenberg). The plural מְשִׁלְמִים does not, certainly, refer directly to the promise made regarding the sprout of David, the Messiah, but at the same time does not stand in contradiction with

it; for the revival and continued existence of the Davidic rule in Israel culminates in the Messiah. On **בַּיִת אֲשֶׁב וּנו'** cf. xxxi. 2 xxx. 3, 18, and the explanations on xxxii. 44. The *Qeri* אֲבָב makes good enough sense, and corresponds better to **וְרֹתְמָתִים**, in so far as exactly follows the fundamental passage, Deut. xxx. 3, where **רְחֵם** is joined with **שָׁבֵב אֶת־שְׁבָות**.

III.—THE LABOUR AND SUFFERING OF THE PROPHET BEFORE AND AFTER THE CONQUEST AND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.—CHAP. XXXIV.—XLV.

Under this title may be placed the whole of the contents of these twelve chapters, which fall into three divisions. The first, ch. xxxiv.—xxxvi., contain partly utterances of Jeremiah in the early part of the siege of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, partly matters of fact in Jehoiakim's time. Next, mention is made in ch. xxxvii.—xxxix., of the toils and sufferings of the prophet during that siege, until the fall of the city; then, in ch. xl.—xli., is depicted his active labour among the people who had been left behind in the land by the Chaldeans, and who afterwards fled to Egypt; finally, as an appendix to the account of his labours among the people, we find, in ch. xl., the words of comfort addressed to Baruch by Jeremiah. The second of these divisions is marked by a historical introduction, ch. xxxvii. 1, 2, and the third by a somewhat lengthened prophetic hearing. Only ch. xxxiv.—xxxvi., which we regard as the first division, seems to be without an external bond of unity. G. Ewald, Nägelbach, and others have consequently marked them as appendices; but in this way neither their position in their connection is at all accounted for. The relation of ch. xxxiv. to the following is analogous to that of ch. xxi. Just as the collection of special announcements regarding judgment and deliverance, ch. xxi., was introduced by the utterances of the prophet in the beginning of the last siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans; so too, in our third division, the collected evidences of the labours of Jeremiah before and after the

destruction of Jerusalem, are introduced, ch. xxxiv., by the utterances which predict quite definitely what shall be the issue of the siege of the city and the fate of the king and people. The first of these utterances is set in a frame of historical statements regarding the siege (vers. 1, 7); this setting marks it out as an introduction to the notices following. But the second utterance, vers. 8-22, refers to the fact of the manumission of the Hebrew men- and maid-servants during the siege, and the cancelling of that measure afterwards. The following chaps., xxxv. xxxvi., furnish two proofs of the activity of the prophet under Jehoiakim, which, on account of their historical nature, could not be introduced till now, since they would not admit of being inserted in the collection of the particular prophecies of coming judgment, ch. xxi.-xxix.

A. PROPHECIES DELIVERED UNDER ZEDEKIAH, AND EVENTS OF JEHOIAKIM'S TIME.—CHAP. XXXIV.—XXXVI.

Chap. xxxiv. *Concerning Zedekiah and the Emancipation of the Men- and Maid-servants.*

This chapter contains two prophecies of the time of the siege of Jerusalem under Zedekiah, of which the first, vers. 1-7, announces to the king the fruitlessness of resistance to the power of the Chaldeans; the second, vers. 8-22, threatens the princes and people of Judah with severe judgments for annulling the manumission of the Hebrew men- and maid-servants. Both of these utterances belong to the first period of the siege, probably the ninth year of the reign of Zedekiah.

Vers. 1-7. *The message to Zedekiah* is regarded by Hitzig, Ewald, Graf, Nägelsbach, etc. as a supplement to ch. xxxii. 1 ff., and as giving, in its complete form, the prophecy to which ch. xxxii. 3 ff. was referred, as the reason of the confinement of Jeremiah in the court of the prison. Certainly it is so far true that Jeremiah, in vers. 2-5, expresses himself more fully regarding the fate of King Zedekiah at the fall of Jerusalem into the hands of the Chaldeans than in ch. xxxii. 3-5, xxi. 3 ff., and xxxvii. 17; but we are not warranted in drawing the inference that this message forms a historical appendix or sup-

plement to ch. xxxii. 3 ff., and was the occasion or reason Jeremiah's imprisonment. See, on the contrary, the remark on xxxii. 3 ff. It is not given here as an appendix to explain the reason of the prophet's imprisonment, but as a prophecy from which we may see how King Zedekiah was forewarned from the very beginning of the siege, of what its issue would be, that he might frame his conduct accordingly. Nor does it belong to the period when Nebuchadnezzar, after beating the Egyptians who had come to the relief of the beleaguered city, had returned to the siege of Jerusalem, but to the earlier period of the siege, when Zedekiah might still cherish the hope of defeating and driving off the Chaldeans through the help of the Egyptians.—According to ver. 1, the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah when "Nebuchadnezzar and," i.e. with, "his host, and all the kingdoms of the land of the dominion of his hand, and all the nations, were fighting against Jerusalem and all her towns." The words are multiplied to represent the strength of the Chaldean army, so as to deepen the impression of overpowering might, against which resistance is vain. The army consists of men drawn from all the kingdoms of the territory he rules, and of all nations. אָרֶץ מִמְשָׁלֶת יְהוָה means the same as אָרֶץ מִמְשָׁלָה, li. 28, the territory over which his dominion, which includes many kingdoms, extends. The LXX have omitted "all the nations" as superfluous. See also the conglomeration of words in a similar description, Ezek. xxvi. "All her towns" are the towns of Judah which belong to Jerusalem; see xix. 15. According to ver. 7, the strong towns not yet taken are meant, especially those strongly fortified, *Lachish* and *Azekah* in the plain (Josh. xv. 39, 35), the former of which is shown still under the name *Um Lakhis*, while the latter is to be sought for in the vicinity of *Socho*; see on Jos. x. 3, 10, and 2 Chron. xi. 9.—Jeremiah is to say to the king

Ver. 2b. "Thus saith Jahveh: Behold, I will deliver the city into the hand of the king of Babylon, that he may burn it with fire. Ver. 3. And thou shalt not escape from his hand, but shalt certainly be seized and delivered into his hand; and thine eyes shall see the eyes of the king of Babylon, and his mouth shall speak with thy mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon. Ver. 4. But hear the word of Jahveh, O Zedekiah, king

of Jndah. Thus saith Jahveh concerning thee : Thou shalt not die by the sword. Ver. 5. In peace shalt thou die ; and as with the burnings of thy fathers, the former kings who were before thee, so shall they make a burning for thee, and they shall wail for thee, [crying,] ‘ Alas, lord ! ’ for I have spoken the word, saith Jahveh.”—On vers. 2, 3, cf. xxxii. 3-5. “ But hear,” ver. 4, introduces an exception to what has been said before ; but the meaning of vers. 4, 5 is disputed. They are usually understood in this way : Zedekiah shall be carried into exile to Babylon, but shall not be killed with the sword, or executed, but shall die a peaceful death, and be buried with royal honours. But C. B. Michaelis, Venema, Hitzig, and Graf take the words as an exception that will occur, should Zedekiah follow the advice given him to deliver himself up to the king of Babylon, instead of continuing the struggle. Then what is denounced in ver. 3 will not happen ; Zedekiah shall not be carried away to Babylon, but shall die as king in Jerusalem. This view rests on the hypothesis that the divine message has for its object to induce the king to submit and give up himself (cf. xxxviii. 17 f.). But this supposition has no foundation ; and what must be inserted, as the condition laid before Zedekiah, “ if thou dost willingly submit to the king of Babylon,” is quite arbitrary, and incompatible with the spirit of the words, “ But hear the word of Jahveh,” for in this case ver. 4 at least would require to run, “ Obey the word of Jahveh ” (שְׁמַע בְּקָרְבָּן יְהוָה), as xxxviii. 20. To take the words “ שְׁמַע בְּקָרְבָּן ” in the sense, “ Give ear to the word, obey the word of Jahveh,” is not merely inadmissible grammatically, but also against the context ; for the word of Jahveh which Zedekiah is to hear, gives no directions as to how he is to act, but is simply an intimation as to what the end of his life shall be : to change or avert this does not stand in his power, so that we cannot here think of obedience or disobedience. The message in vers. 4, 5 states more in detail what that was which lay before Zedekiah : he shall fall into the hands of the king of Babylon, be carried into exile in Babylon, yet shall not die a violent death through the sword, but die peacefully, and be buried with honour,—not, like Jehoiakim, fall in battle, and be left unmourned and unburied (xxii. 18 f.). This intimation accords with the notices

given elsewhere as to the end of Zedekiah (xxxii. 5, xxxix. 5-7). Although Zedekiah died a prisoner in Babylon (lii. 11), yet his imprisonment would not necessarily be an obstacle in the way of an honourable burial after the fashion of his fathers. When Jehoiachin, after an imprisonment of thirty-seven years, was raised again to royal honours, then also might there be accorded not merely a tolerably comfortable imprisonment to Zedekiah himself, but to the Jews also, at his death, the permission to bury their king according to their national custom. Nor is anything to be found elsewhere contrary to this view of the word. The supposition that Zedekiah caused the prophet to be imprisoned on account of this message to him, which Nägelsbach has laboured hard to reconcile with the common acceptation of the passage, is wholly devoid of foundation in fact, and does not suit the time into which this message falls; for Jeremiah was not imprisoned till after the time when the Chaldeans were obliged for a season to raise the siege, on the approach of the Egyptians, and that, too, not at the command of the king, but by the watchman at the gate, on pretence that he was a deserter. "Thou shalt die in peace," in contrast with "thou shalt die in the sword," marks a peaceful death on a bed of sickness in contrast with execution, but not (what Graf introduces into the words) in addition, his being deposited in the sepulchre of his fathers. "With the burnings of thy fathers," etc., is to be understood, according to 2 Chron. xvi. 14, xxi. 19, of the burning of aromatic spices in honour of the dead; for the burning of corpses was not customary among the Hebrews: see 2 Chron. xvi. 14. On "alas, lord!" see xxii. 18. This promise is strengthened by the addition, "for I have spoken the word," where the emphasis lies on the **אני**: *I* the Lord have spoken the word, which therefore shall certainly be fulfilled.—In verse 6, 7 it is further remarked in conclusion, that Jeremiah addressed these words to the king during the siege of Jerusalem when all the cities of Judah except Lachish and Azek were already in the power of the Chaldeans. עָרִים מִבָּאָרֶב not in apposition to עָרִים יְהוּדָה, but belongs to נִשְׁאָרָה: "there were left among the towns of Judah as strong cities;" of the strong cities of Judah, they alone had not yet been conquered.

Vers. 8-22. THREATENING BECAUSE OF THE RE-ENSLAVEMENT OF THE LIBERATED HEBREW MEN- AND MAID-SERVANTS.

—Vers. 8-11 describe the occasion of the word of the Lord, which follows in vers. 12-22. It came to Jeremiah “after King Zedekiah had made a covenant with all the people in Jerusalem, to proclaim liberty to them, that every one should send away his man-servant, or his maid-servant, being a Hebrew or Hebrewess, so that none should impose servitude on any one of them who was a Jew, his brother. Ver. 10. And all the princes and all the people who entered into the covenant obeyed, each one setting free his man-servant and his maid-servant, and not imposing servitude on them any more: they obeyed and each one set them free. Ver. 11. But they turned round afterwards, and brought back the servants and the handmaids whom they had set free, and brought them under subjection, for servants and for handmaids.” The covenant which Zedekiah concluded with all the people at Jerusalem, according to what follows, consisted in a solemn vow made before the Lord in the temple, probably confirmed by sacrifices, to set free the male and female slaves of Hebrew descent, in conformity with the law, Ex. xxi. 1-4, Deut. xv. 12. The law required the gratuitous manumission of these after seven years of service. This time, indeed, is not mentioned in our verses, but it is assumed as well known through the law. But, in the general departure of the people from the Lord and His commandments, the observance of this law had probably long been intermitted, so that, in consequence of the solemn engagement to obey it once more, a great number of Hebrew male and female slaves received their freedom, inasmuch as very many had served longer than seven years; however, we need not suppose that all bond men and women were liberated at once. The resolution, ver. 9, that every one should liberate his Hebrew man- or maid-servant, and that no one should continue to impose servitude on a Jew, his brother, *i.e.* compel him any longer to serve as a slave, is conditioned by the law, which is assumed as well known: this also accords with the expression **לְבָלִתִי עֲבָדָתֶם**, which is used in a general way of the treatment of Hebrew men- and maid-servants, Lev. xxv. 39. However, it is also possible that a liberation of all bond men and women took place without regard to the

duration of their servitude, partly for the purpose of averting by such obedience to the law, the calamity now threatening the city, and partly also to employ the liberated slaves in the defence of the city; for, according to ver. 21 f., the emancipation took place during the siege of Jerusalem, and after the departure of the Chaldeans the solemn promise was revoked. The expression קָרָא דָרוֹר, “to proclaim liberty,” is taken from Lev. xxv. 10, but it does not prove that the manumission took place on sabbath- or a jubilee-year. לְהַמְּנֻסָּה refers *ad sensum* to those who were bondmen and had a right to be set free. The general expression is explained by שְׁלַח חֲפֵשִׁים, and this again is more closely defined by לְבַלְתִּי עֲבָדָתְךָם (cf. Lev. xxv. 39). הַצִּיּוֹן אֲחִיהָו אֲשֶׁר, (that no one should labour) “through a Jew, who is his brother,” *i.e.* a fellow-countryman; *i.e.* that no one should impose servitude on a Jew, as being a compatriot. “To enter into covenant” is to assume its obligation; cf. 2 Chron. xv. 12, Eze xvi. 8. The *Kethib* receives, in the *Qeri*, the vowels of the Kal, since the Hiphil of this verb does not occur elsewhere only the Kal, cf. 2 Chron. xxviii. 10; but the alteration is unnecessary,—the Hiphil may intensify the active meaning.

Vers. 12–22. *The threat of punishment.*—Ver. 12. “The word of Jahveh came to Jeremiah from Jahveh, saying.” Ver. 13. Thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, ‘I made covenant with your fathers in the day when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, from a house of bondmen, saying.’ Ver. 14. At the end of seven years shall ye set free each man his brother, who is a Hebrew that sold himself to thee; and I shall serve thee six years, then shalt thou send him away from thee free: but your fathers hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear. Ver. 15. But *you* had turned just now, and had done what is right in mine eyes, because each man proclaimed liberty to his neighbour, and ye had made a covenant before me in the house on which my name is called. Ver. 16. But ye turned again and profaned my name, and each one made his man-servant and his handmaid, whom he had sent away free, at their pleasure, to return, and ye brought them in subjection, to be men- and maid-servants to you. Ver. 17. Therefore, thus saith Jahveh, Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty each man to his brother, and each man

to his neighbour: behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith Jahveh, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to famine, and I will deliver you up for maltreatment to all the kingdoms of the earth. Ver. 18. And I shall make the men who have transgressed my covenant, that have not kept the words of the covenant which they concluded before me, like the calf which they cut in two, and between whose pieces they passed. Ver. 19. The princes of Judah and the princes of Jerusalem, the courtiers, and the priests, and all the people of the land, who passed through between the pieces of the calf, Ver. 20. Them will I give into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of those who seek their life, so that their corpses shall be for food to the birds of heaven and to the beasts of the earth. Ver. 21. And Zedekiah, king of Judah, and his princes will I give into the hand of their enemies, and into the hand of those who seek their life, and into the hand of the army of the king of Babylon, that has departed from against you. Ver. 22. Behold, I will command, saith Jahveh, and will make them return to this city, and they shall fight against it, and shall take it, and shall burn it with fire; and the cities of Judah will I make a desolation, without an inhabitant."

In vers. 13-16 the Lord sets before the people and their rulers their new offence; in vers. 17-22 He announces to them the punishment for this new deed by which the covenant is broken. In order to place the transgression in its proper light, He mentions, first of all, that, when He led Israel out of Egypt, He concluded with them a covenant to the effect that every one of them should set free his Hebrew servant at the end of seven years; He also mentions that their fathers had transgressed this covenant (vers. 13, 14). The designation of Egypt as a house of bondmen, as in Ex. xiii. 3, 14, xx. 2, Deut. vi. 12, etc., possesses a special emphasis, and points to what is mentioned in Deut. xv. 15 as the motive for obeying the law referred to in the address. Because Israel was a servant in Egypt, and the Lord has redeemed him out of this house of bondmen, therefore must they not treat as slaves their brethren who had fallen into poverty, but set them free after six years of service. The expression "at the end (after the lapse) of seven years" is to be understood in the same way as the expression "after

eight days." As this just means "when seven days are completed," so also, according to the law, Ex. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 1 the emancipation was to follow in the seventh year, after 8 full years of service. "Who sold himself to thee" is an expression copied from Deut. xv. 12.—From this sin of the fathers they had now for a little turned away, and, in a solemn covenant, resolved to free the bondmen, as the law decreed (ver. 15); but they have immediately profaned the name of the Lord again by revoking this decree, viz. by breaking the covenant made before God. **לְפָנֶיךָ נִפְשַׁת**, "according to their pleasure like **לְפָנֶיךָ נִפְשַׁת**," Deut. xxi. 14.—Ver. 17 ff. The announcement of punishment. Because ye have not hearkened, by proclaiming liberty to every one, liberty to his bondman (this certainly had been done but was again undone by annulling the decree), therefore proclaim liberty for you; *i.e.* you, who have hitherto been my servants (Lev. xxv. 55), I discharge from this relation,—deliver you up to your fate as regards the sword, etc., that the sword, famine, and pestilence may have power over you. For **וְעַל** is used in ver. 4.—In ver. 18 the construction is disputed. Many, including Luther, take **הַעֲלֵל** as the second object to **וְעַתָּה**: "I will make the men the calf," *i.e.* like the calf. But, though **וְעַתָּה** is frequently construed with a double accusative with the meaning of making some thing another thing (cf. *e.g.* ver. 2 Gen. xvii. 5, Ex. vii. 1), yet in such a case the predicative object does not readily take the article. Moreover, **וְעַתָּה**, in the sense required here, to make like=treat as, is joined with **וְעַתָּה** as in Isa. xli. 2, Ezek. xxviii. 2, 6, Gen. xlvi. 30, 1 Kings 27, etc. Finally, Rosenmüller objects: *continuata versu personarum descriptio et repetitio verbi וְעַתָּה* in ver. 20 *vix permittunt, propositionem hoc versu absolvit.* For these reasons L. de Dieu, Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Graf have taken **הַעֲלֵל** being in apposition to **הַבְּרִית**, and the enumeration "princes of Judah," etc., ver. 19, as a continuation or exposition of **וְעַתָּה נִשְׁׁמָם** in ver. 18, and **וְעַתָּה אֲוֹתָם**, ver. 20, as a resumption of the same words in ver. 18. According to this view, vers. 18–20 will form a series of appositions: "I will give the men . . . that have not kept the words of the covenant which they concluded before me the princes of Judah who passed between the parts of the calf,—these will I give into the hands of their enemies."

But, apart from the consideration that the enumeration of the covenant-breakers (viz. the princes of Judah, etc.), which is added by way of apposition in ver. 19, ought not to come in till after the apposition to בְּרִית, which would be a harsh and complicated arrangement of the members of the sentence, this construction seems untenable for the following reasons: (a) "The calf that they cut," etc., which forms the explanatory apposition to "the covenant," is separated from it by the intervening clause, "which they made before me." And (b), even though we might modify this harshness by repeating אֲתִידְבָּרִי before הַעֲלֵל, yet the mode of expression, "they have not performed the words of the calf which they cut in two, and between whose parts they passed," would be a very stiff and unnatural one for "they have not performed what they vowed or sware in presence of the parts of the calf which they had halved, and when they passed through between these pieces." With Maurer and Hitzig, therefore, we abide by the older view, which takes הַעֲלֵל as the second object to וַיַּעֲשֵׂה: "I will make the men . . . the calf," or, better, "like the calf which they cut in two," etc. The article is used with עַל because this predicate is more exactly determined by relative clauses, and הַעֲלֵל stands for בְּעַל, since, as often happens, the בְּ of likeness is dropped to give more point to the idea. We make ver. 19 begin a new sentence, and take the names of this verse as objects absolute, which, by אֲוֹתָם וַיַּעֲשֵׂה, are subordinated to the verb: "As for the princes of Judah . . . them shall I give . . ."—From ver. 18 we see that, when alliances were entered into, the contracting parties slaughtered an עַל, "calf," i.e. a young bullock, cut it in two halves, and went through between the pieces that were placed opposite one another. See on Gen. xv. 10 for details regarding this most ancient custom and its meaning: according to the account of Ephraem Syrus, it is of Chaldean origin. Thus are explained the phrases used to signify the making of a covenant. בְּרִית בָּרִית, to cut a covenant, ὅρκια τέμνειν, fædus ferire, i.e. ferienda hostia fædus facere. We cannot with certainty infer, from the threatening pronounced in this passage, that this rite originally signified nothing more than that he who broke his promise would be treated like the animal that had been slaughtered. For the threatening is merely a conclusion

drawn from the sacred act; but this does not exclude a deep meaning of the rite.—Vers. 19–22 give the real explanation the threatening attached to the ritual of the covenant. Prince officers of the court, priests and people, who have transgressed the covenant, shall die by the hand of the enemy, and per ignominiously. On ver. 20b, cf. vii. 33, xvi. 4, etc. On יִמְשָׁלְךָ see on Gen. xxxvii. 36. King Zedekiah also, with his prince his retinue, shall fall into the hand of his enemies, ay, into the hands of the Chaldeans, who have now withdrawn from Jerusalem (on לְלֹא מִלְאָה see on xxi. 2). See also xxxvii. 5–8.

Chap. xxxv. *The Example of the Rechabites.*

By the command of God, Jeremiah brings the family of the Rechabites (who had fled for refuge to Jerusalem before the approach of the Chaldeans) into one of the chambers of the temple, and sets before them some wine to drink (vers. 1–5). They decline to drink, because the head of their family had forbidden them the use of wine, as well as the possession of houses and the cultivation of the soil, and had commanded them to live in tents (vers. 6–11). Jeremiah is to put them before the people of Judah. The Rechabites faithfully observe the command of their ancestor, while the people of Judah transgress the commands of their God, which are continually presented to them (vers. 12–16). Therefore the threatening calamity shall fall upon Judah; but the house of Rechab, as a reward for their faithfulness to the injunctions of their ancestor, shall continue for ever (vers. 17–19).

According to ver. 1, this word of the Lord came to Jeremiah in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, and, according to ver. 11, previous to the arrival of Nebuchadnezzar and his host before Jerusalem; therefore perhaps in the summer of the year 606 B.C., for Jerusalem was taken for the first time by Nebuchadnezzar in the ninth month (December) of that year.

Vers. 1–11. *Jeremiah's dealings with the Rechabites*—Vers. 1–2. Jeremiah is to go to the house, *i.e.* the family, of the Rechabites, speak with them, and bring them into one of the chambers of the temple, and set before them wine to drink, בְּנֵי בֵּית־הַרְכָּבִים, vers. 2, 3, 18, is exchanged for בְּנֵי בֵּית־הַרְכָּבִים, ver. 18, from which it is apparent that “the house of the Rechabite

does not mean their dwelling-place, but the family, called in 1 Chron. ii. 55 בֵּית־רְחָבָב. According to this passage, the Rechabites were a branch of the Kenites, *i.e.* descendants of the *Kenite*, the father-in-law of Moses (Judg. i. 16), who had gone to Canaan with the Israelites, and dwelt among them, partly in the wilderness on the southern frontier of the tribe of Judah (1 Sam. xv. 6, xxvii. 10, xxx. 29), partly at Kadesh in Naphtali (Judg. iv. 11, 17, v. 24). Their ancestor, or father of the tribe, was Rechab, the father of Jonadab, with whom Jehu made a friendly alliance (2 Kings x. 15, 23). Jonadab had laid on them the obligation to live in the special manner mentioned below, in order to keep them in the simplicity of nomad life observed by their fathers, and to preserve them from the corrupting influences connected with a settled life. לְשָׁכּוֹת, “cells of the temple,” were additional buildings in the temple fore-courts, used partly for keeping the stores of the temple (1 Chron. xxviii. 12), partly as dwellings for those who served in it, and as places of meeting for those who came to visit it; see Ezek. xl. 17.—Ver. 3. In executing the command of the Lord, Jeremiah took (went for) Jaazaniah, son of Jeremiah, son of Habaziniah, and all his brethren, and sons, and the whole house of the Rechabites, and brought them into the temple-chamber of the sons of Hanan. Jaazaniah was probably the then chief of the Rechabites. The chamber of the sons of Hanan was situated next the princes' chamber, which stood over that of Maaseiah the door-keeper. Nothing further is known about Hanan the son of Jigdaliah; here he is called “the man of God,” an honourable title of the prophets,—see *e.g.* 1 Kings xii. 22,—for, according to the usual mode of construction, אִישׁ הַאֲלֹהִים does not belong to *Jigdaliah*, but to *Hanan*, cf. xxviii. 1, Zech. i. 1. “The chamber of the princes” is the chamber where the princes, the chiefs of the people, used to assemble in the temple. Its position is more exactly described by לְלִי מִטְּמָעֵל, “over the chamber of Maaseiah,” but not very clearly for us, since the buildings of the temple fore-courts are nowhere else more exactly described; however, see on xxxvi. 10. Maaseiah was שָׁמָר תְּפִלָּה, “keeper of the threshold,” *i.e.* overseer of the watchmen of the temple gates, of which, according to lii. 24 and 2 Kings xxv. 18, there were three, who are

there mentioned along with the high priest and his substitut^o Maaseiah is probably the same whose son Zephaniah was הַנְּפָשָׁנָה, cf. lli. 24 with xxxvii. 3, xxix. 25, and xxi. 1.—Ver. 5 There, Jeremiah caused bowls filled with wine to be set before the Rechabites, and commauded them to drink. (בְּבִיעִים פְּסָתָה, a large goblets, bowls, out of which drinking-cups [פְּסָתָה] were filled.) But they explained that they did not drink wine because their father, *i.e.* their ancestor, Jonadab had forbidd^o them and their posterity to drink wine for ever, as also to build houses, to sow seed, and to plant vineyards, *i.e.* to settle themselves down in permanent dwellings and to pursue agriculture (בְּנָא בְּנָה לְכָם, “And there shall not be to you,” *sc.* what has just been named, *i.e.* ye must not possess houses, growing-crops, vineyards (cf. ver. 9),¹ but ye are to dwell in tents all your life, that ye may live long, etc. This promise is an imitation of that found in Ex. xx. 12.—Vers. 8–10. This command of their forefather they observe in all points, and therefore dwell in tents; and only because of Nebuchadnezzar’s arrival in the country have they come to Jerusalem, in order to find refuge for a time from the army of the Chaldeans and that of Aram (the Arameans). The special mention of the army of Aram in connection with that of the Chaldeans is perhaps due to the frequent predatory incursions made, at an earlier period, on Israel and Judah by the Syrians. According to 2 Kings xxi. 2, after Jehoiakim had rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, host bands of Arameans invaded Judah for the purpose of laying waste the country.

Vers. 12–19. *The example of the Rechabites is one for Judah*—Jeremiah is to proclaim the word of the Lord to the people of Judah, as follows: Ver. 13. “Thus saith Jahveh of hos

¹ These injunctions, given by Jonadab to his posterity, that he might make them always lead a nomad life, are quoted by Diodorus Siculus, x. 94, as a law among the Nabateans: Νόμος ἐστίν αὐτοῖς, μήτε σίτου σπείρω μήτε φυτεύειν μηδὲν φυτὸν καρποφόρον, μήτε οἶνῳ κρῆσθαι, μήτε οικίαν κατεκενάζειν; while the object of the law is stated to have been the maintenance of their freedom against the more powerful who sought to bring them into subjection. And even at the present day the Bedouins imagine that they are prevented, by the nobility of their descent from Ishmael, from engaging in agriculture, handicraft, or the arts; cf. Arvieux, *Süd der Beduinen-Araber*, 5 f.

the God of Israel: Go and say to the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Will ye not receive instruction by listening to my words? saith Jahveh. Ver. 14. The words of Jonadab the son of Rechab, who commanded his sons not to drink wine, are performed, and they have drunk no wine to this day, but have obeyed the command of their father. But *I* have spoken unto you, rising up early and speaking, yet ye have not listened unto me. Ver. 15. And I sent unto you all my servants the prophets, rising early and sending them, saying, Turn ye, now, every one from his evil way, and do good deeds, and do not go after other gods, to serve them; then shall ye dwell in the land which I have given to you and to your fathers. But ye did not incline your ear, nor hearken unto me. Ver. 16. Yea, the children of Jonadab the son of Rechab have observed the commandment of their father which he commanded them, while this people have not hearkened unto me. Ver. 17. Therefore, thus saith Jahveh, the God of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will bring upon Judah and on the inhabitants of Jerusalem all the evil which I have uttered regarding them, because I spake unto them and they did not hear, and I called unto them, but they did not answer. Ver. 18. And to the house of the Rechabites Jeremiah said: Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel, Because ye have listened to the command of Jonadab your father, and have kept all his commandments, and have done according to all that he commanded you, Ver. 19. Therefore, thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel, Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me for ever."

The command, "Go and speak to the men of Judah," etc., shows that it was not in the chamber of the temple, in presence of the Rechabites, but probably in one of the temple fore-courts, that Jeremiah addressed the following word of the Lord to the people assembled there. In order to shame the Jews thoroughly, he shows them the faithfulness with which the Rechabites observe the ordinances of their ancestor Jonadab. The character of the address, as one intended to rouse feelings of shame, is indicated even at the beginning of ver. 13: "Will ye not receive instruction by hearkening to the words of the Lord?" The Hoph. מִקְרָא is construed as a passive with the accus.; in the

older writers we frequently find this construction, in which the passive is used impersonally, hence the sing. is here employed cf. Ges. § 143, 1, Ew. § 295, b. "To this day"—now for near 300 years without interruption; for Jonadab was already held in high esteem when Jehu ascended the throne, 883 B.C. (Kings x. 15). Judah, on the contrary, does not listen to the commandments which his God unceasingly inculcates on him but rather wanders after other gods, to serve them. On ver. 1 cf. xxv. 4, 5. אֶל־הַאֲרָמָה stands for עַל־הַאֲרָמָה, xxv. 5.—In ver. 16, where the introductory וְ, *imo*, indicates a culmination, the idea is once more briefly expressed. Nägelsbach incorrect renders וְ "because," and makes ver. 16 the protasis to ver. 1 "Such a protasis with *because* (*quia*), without any connection with what precedes, is contrary to the use of language" (Hitzig). On the threat of punishment in ver. 17, see xi. 11.—Ver. 1 The declaration concerning the Rechabites is introduced by the formula, "And to the house of the Rechabites Jeremiah said; thereby, too, it is shown that the statement does not form an integral portion of the preceding address, but was uttered by Jeremiah perhaps at the close of his transactions with the people (ver. 11). But it is not given till now, in order to signify to the people of Judah that even fidelity to paternal command has its own rewards, to make the threat uttered against Judah all the more impressive. On the promise ver. 19, cf. xxxiii. 1. Since עַמְרָר לִפְנֵי denotes the standing of a servant before his master, and in vii. 10 is used of the appearance of the people before the Lord in the temple, עַמְרָר לִפְנֵי seems here also to express not merely the permanence of the family, but in addition their continuance in the service of the Lord, without, of course involving sacerdotal service; cf. on the other hand, xxxiii. 1 where this service is more exactly described. The acknowledgment of the Lord on the part of the Rechabites is a necessary result of their connection with Israel.¹

¹ According to the account of the Jewish missionary Wolff, there are still some Rechabites in Asia, in Mesopotamia and Yemen, who affirm that they are descended from Hobab the brother-in-law [A.V. "father-in-law" but see Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i. *Hobab*] of Moses. Wolff points out that part of the desert of Yemen near Senaa as the special locality where these Rechabites live. Cf. Dr. Joseph Wolff, *ein Wanderleben*, von I. Sengermann, Hamburg 1863, S. 65 u. 196.

Chap. xxxvi. Jeremiah's Discourses are written down, and read in the Temple.

In the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah, bidding him commit to writing all the addresses he had previously delivered, that Judah might, if it were possible, still regard the threatenings and return (vers. 1-3). In accordance with this command, he got all the words of the Lord written down in a book by his attendant Baruch, with the further instruction that this should be read on the fast-day in the temple to the people who came out of the country into Jerusalem (vers. 4-8). When, after this, in the ninth month of the fifth year of Jehoiakim, a fast was appointed, Baruch read the prophecies to the assembled people in the chamber of Gemariah in the temple. Michaiah the son of Gemariah mentioned the matter to the princes who were assembled in the royal palace; these then sent for Baruch with the roll, and made him read it to them. But they were so frightened by what was read to them that they deemed it necessary to inform the king regarding it (vers. 9-19). At their advice, the king had the roll brought and some of it read before him; but scarcely had some few columns been read, when he cut the roll into pieces and threw them into the pan of coals burning in the room, at the same time commanding that Baruch and Jeremiah should be brought to him; but God hid them (vers. 20-26). After this roll had been burnt, the Lord commanded the prophet to get all his words written on a new roll, and to predict an ignominious fate for King Jehoiakim; whereupon Jeremiah once more dictated his addresses to Baruch (vers. 27-32).

Since Jeremiah, according to vers. 3, 6, 7, is to get his addresses written down that Baruch may be able to read them publicly on the fast-day, now at hand, because he himself was prevented from getting to the temple, the intention of the divine command was not to make the prophet put down in writing and gather together all the addresses he had hitherto given, but the writing down is merely to serve as a means of once more presenting to the people the whole contents of his prophecies, in order to induce them, wherever it was possible, to return to the Lord. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadnezzar, after

vanquishing the Egyptians at the Euphrates, advanced again Judah, took Jerusalem, and made Jehoiakim tributary. In the same year, too, Jeremiah had delivered the prophecy regarding the giving up of Judah and all nations for seventy years in the power of the king of Babylon (chap. xxv.); this was before he had been bidden write down all his addresses. For, that he did not receive this command till towards the end of the fourth year, may be gathered with certainty from the fact that the public reading of the addresses, after they were written down, was to take place on the fast-day, which, according to ver. 29, was not held till the ninth month of the fifth year. The only doubtful point is, whether they were written down and read before or after the first capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Most modern commentators take the former view, e.g. Hitzig says, briefly and decidedly, "According to ver. 29, the Chaldeans had not as yet appeared in the country." But this is not mentioned in ver. 29. The threatening in this verse, "The king of Babylon shall come and destroy this land, and exterminate men and beasts from it," does not prove that the king of Babylon had not yet come to Judah, but merely that the country had not yet been destroyed, and men and cattle exterminated from it. When Jerusalem was first taken, Nebuchadnezzar contented himself with subjecting Jehoiakim under his supreme authority and requiring the payment of tribute, as well as carrying away some of the vessels of the temple and some hostages. The devastation of Judah and the extirpation of men and beasts did not commence till the second subjugation of Jerusalem under Jehoiakim, and was completed when the city was utterly destroyed, in Zedekiah's time, on the third subjugation. The settlement of the question that has been raised depends on the determination of the object for which the special fast-day in the fifth year was appointed, whether for averting the threatened invasion by the Chaldeans, or as a memorial of the first capture of Jerusalem. This question we have already so far decided in the Commentary on *Daniel*, p. 66, where it is stated that the fast was held in remembrance of that day in the year when Jerusalem was taken for the first time by Nebuchadnezzar; we have also remarked in the same place, that Jehoiakim either appointed or permitted this spec

fast “ for the purpose of rousing the popular feeling against the Chaldeans, to whom they were in subjection,—to evoke in the people a religious enthusiasm in favour of resistance ; for Jehoiakim keenly felt the subjugation by the Chaldeans, and from the first thought of revolt.” However, every form of resistance to the king of Babylon could only issue in the ruin of Judah. Accordingly, Jeremiah made Baruch read his prophecies publicly to the people assembled in the temple on that day, “ by way of counterpoise to the king’s desire ;” the prophet also bade him announce to the king that the king of Babylon would come, *i.e.* return, to destroy the land, and to root out of it both men and beasts. These circumstances give the first complete explanation of the terror of the princes when they listened to the reading of the book (ver. 16), as well as of the wrath of the king, exhibited by his cutting the book in pieces and throwing it into the fire : he saw that the addresses of the prophet were more calculated to damp those religious aspirations of the people on which he based his hopes, than to rouse the nation against continued submission to the Chaldeans. Not till now, too, when the object of the appointment of the fast-day was perceived, did the command given by God to the prophet to write down his prophecies appear in its proper light. Shortly before, and in the most earnest manner, Jeremiah had reminded the people of their opposition to the word of God preached by him for twenty-three years, and had announced to them, as a punishment, the seventy years’ subjugation to the Chaldeans and the desolation of the country ; yet this announcement of the fearful chastisement had made no deeper or more lasting impression on the people. Hence, so long as the threatened judgment was still in the distance, not much could be expected to result from the reading of his addresses in the temple on the fast-day, so that the command of God to do so should appear quite justified. But the matter took a considerably different form when Nebuchadnezzar had actually taken Jerusalem and Jehoiakim had submitted. The commencement of the judgments which had been threatened by God was the proper moment for laying before the hearts of the people, once more, the intense earnestness of the divine message, and for urging them to deeper penitence. Just at this point

the reading of the whole contents of the prophecies delivered by Jeremiah appears like a final attempt to preserve the people on whom judgment has fallen, from complete destruction.

Vers. 2-8. The word of the Lord to Jeremiah was to the effect: “Take thee a book-roll, and write on it (אָלֵחַ for לְלַחֵד) all the words that I have spoken unto thee concerning Israel and Judah, and concerning all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah till this day. Ver. 3. Perhaps the house of Judah will hear all the evil which I meditate doing to them, that they may return every one from his evil way, and that I may forgive their iniquity and their sin.” מִשְׁמָר here means, to hear correctly and lay to heart; cf. xxvi. Hitzig views the command as meaning, not that Jeremiah now for the first time to write down his addresses (which would be an impossibility for the most faithful memory), but that it is merely to write them down together in one book, out of the several scattered leaves and scraps. Graf has already refuted this view, though more fully than was necessary. It is not copying, word for word, of every separate address that is meant, but merely a writing down of the essential contents of all the oral discourses. This is quite clear, not merely from what is stated in ver. 3 as the object of this command, but also from the character of these collected addresses, as they are preserved to us. That the expression “all the words” is not to be understood in the most rigid sense, follows from the very fact that when Jeremiah anew wrote down his prophecies, ver. 32, he further added “many similar words” to what had been contained in the first book-roll, which was burned by Jehoiakim. But Jeremiah might perhaps be able to retain in his memory the substance of all the addresses he had delivered during the twenty-three years, since all of them treated of the same subjects—reproof of prevailing sins, threat of punishment, and promises.—Ver. 4. Jeremiah carries out the divine command by making Baruch write down on a book-roll all the words of the Lord, out of his mouth (בְּרַמְּנֵי יְהוָה, i.e. at the dictation of Jeremiah); and since he himself is prevented from getting to the house of the Lord, he bids him read the words he had written down in the ears of the people in the temple on the fast-day at the same time expressing the hope, ver. 7: “Perhaps the

supplication will fall down before the Lord, and they will return each one from his wicked way; for great is the wrath and the anger which the Lord hath expressed concerning this people." Baruch, who is mentioned so early as xxxii. 12 ff. as the attendant of the prophet, was, according to the passage now before us, his amanuensis, and executed his commissions. **אָנָּי עָצָר**, according to xxxiii. 1 and xxxix. 15, might mean, "I am in prison;" but this does not accord with the request of the princes, ver. 19, that Jeremiah should hide himself. Moreover, **עָצָר** does not mean "seized, *captus*," but "stopped, restrained, hindered;" see on Neh. vi. 10. The cause of hindrance is not mentioned, as being away from the purpose of the narrative. "To read in the roll in the ears of the people," *i.e.* to read to the people out of the book. **בַּיּוֹם צוֹם** does not mean "on any fast-day whatever," but, "on the fast-day." The article is omitted because there was no need for defining the fast-day more exactly. The special fast-day mentioned in ver. 9 is intended. **תְּפִלָּה תַּחֲנֹתָם וְנוּ**, "their supplication will fall down before the Lord," *i.e.* reach unto God, as if it were laid before His feet. **נִפְלָא** is transferred from the posture of the suppliant —his falling down before God—to his supplication. Hence, in Hiphil, to make the supplication fall down before the Lord is equivalent to laying the request at His feet; xxxviii. 26, xlvi. 9, Dan. ix. 18, 20. If the supplication actually comes before God, it is also heard and finds success. This success is pointed out in **וַיִּשְׁבְּיִ וְנוּ**, "that they may repent." If man, in a repentant spirit, supplicates God for grace, God grants him power for conversion. But the return of the people from their wicked way is indispensable, because the wrath which God has expressed concerning it is great, *i.e.* because God has threatened a heavy judgment of wrath.—Ver. 8. Baruch executes his commission.

Vers. 9-19. *The reading of the book in the temple.*—Ver. 9. In the fifth year of Jehoiakim, in the ninth month, "they proclaimed a fast before the Lord,—all the people in Jerusalem, and all the people who had come out of the cities of Judah to Jerusalem." **קְרָא צוֹם**, *to call, declare, appoint a fast*; cf. 1 Kings xxi. 9, 12, 2 Chron. xx. 3. From the tenor of the words, the people who lived in Jerusalem and those who had come thither out of the country might seem to have called the

fast. But this is impossible ; for the people from the cities of Judah evidently came to Jerusalem only in consequence of a fast being appointed. Hence Graf is of opinion that **בַּיּוֹם** seems here used in a general way of the keeping of such a fast. This view is not confirmed by any parallel instances. The expression is inexact, and the inexactness has arisen from effort to attain greater conciseness of expression. The meaning is this : a fast was proclaimed, and all the people in Jerusalem and out of the cities of Judah came to worship the Lord in the temple. It remains doubtful with whom the appointment originated,—whether with the king, or with the high priest or the priesthood. The ninth month corresponds to our December and consequently came round with the cold season ; cf. ver. 2. The fast-day was a special one ; for in the law only the day of atonement, in the seventh month, was prescribed as a fast-day. On the object of this measure, see *supra*, p. 94 f.—Ver. 10. On this day Baruch read the addresses of Jeremiah out of the book to the people who had come to the temple, in the “chamber of Gemariah, the son of Shaphan, the scribe, in the upper court, at the entrance of the new gate of the house of the Lord.” Gemariah the son of Shaphan was one of the king’s private scribes, a secretary of state. For, according to ver. 10, he belonged to the princes, and was probably a brother of Ahikam the son of Shaphan, who had already shown himself before this, a protector of the prophet (xxvi. 24). The chamber in which he had in the temple was situated in the upper court, at the entrance of the new gate, whose position cannot exactly determine (see on xxvi. 10), but which led from the outer to the inner court of the priests, which rose higher than the others.—Ver. 11. Micaiah, a son of Gemariah, was listening to the reading ; and he it was who brought the news into the palace. He made for the room, *i.e.* the office, of Iddo the shama, the secretary of state, where the princes, viz. Elishama, Delaiah the son of Shemaiah, Elnathan the son of Achbor (xxvi. 22), Gemariah the son of Shaphan, and Zedekiah the son of Hananiah, had just met for a consultation ; and he mentioned to them what he had heard.—Ver. 14. On this information the princes sent Jehudi (perhaps one of the under-officers of the secretary of state) to Baruch, to bring him, with the book,

from which he had read. From the designation, “Jehudi son of Nethaniah, son of Shelemiah, son of Cushi,” Hitzig and Graf conclude that the first and last are not proper names, but appellatives, “the Jew” and “the Cushite,” and account for the use of them on the ground that, through the application of the law given in Deut. xxiii. 7, 8 to Cushites as well as Egyptians, the ancestor was a Cushite, and only his great-grandson became a Jew, or Jewish citizen, and was called “Jehudi.” But this view is opposed (1) by the fact that the names of the father and the grandfather are true proper names, and these, moreover, contain the name *Jah* (*Jahveh*), — hence are genuine proper names of Israelites; moreover, (2) even in olden times *Jehudith* occurs as a woman’s name, Gen. xxvi. 34. According to this, *Jehudi* is a true proper name, and at the most, *Cushi* is but a surname of the great-grandfather, given him because of his descent from the Cushites. Further, the law, Deut. xxiii. 7, applies only to the posterity of the Edomites and Egyptians, that these should not be received into the congregation of the Lord till the third generation; this ordinance was based on grounds which did not permit of its application to other nations. These might be naturalized even in the first generation on undergoing circumcision, with the exception of Canaanites, Ammonites, and Moabites, who were not to be admitted into the Israelitish community even in the tenth generation, Deut. xxiii. 3.—Ver. 15. When Baruch came, the princes, in token of friendly and respectful treatment, bade him sit down and read to them out of the book he had brought with him. Ver. 16. But when they heard all the words read, “they were afraid one at another;” *i.e.* by looks, gestures, and words, they gave mutual expression of their fear, partly because of the contents of what had been read. Although they were generally acquainted with the sense and the spirit of Jeremiah’s addresses, yet what had now been read made a powerful impression on them; for Baruch plainly had read, both to the people in the temple and to the princes, not the whole book, but only the main portions, containing the sternest denunciations of sin and the strongest threats of punishment. The statement, “he read in (out of) the book the words of Jeremiah” (ver. 10), does not mean that he read the whole book;

this would only have wearied the people and weakened the impression made. But they were partly also terrified, perhaps by the boldness of a declaration which so decidedly opposed the desires and hopes of the king; for the thought of the events mentioned xxvi. 20 ff. would at once suggest to them the danger that might arise to the lives of Jeremiah and Baruch from the despotic character of the king. They said therefore to Baruch, "We must tell the king all these things." For it was clear that the matter could not long remain concealed from the king, after the public reading in the temple. Hence they dared not, agreeably to their official relation to the king, hide from him what had taken place.—Ver. 17. Meanwhile, in order to inform themselves more exactly regarding what had happened, they ask Baruch, "Tell us, how hast thou written these words at his mouth?" Thereupon Baruch replied, "I used to call aloud these words to me," i.e. he used to dictate them to me by word of mouth, "and I wrote them in the book with ink." The imperfect expresses the repeated or continuous doing of anything; hence קָרָא here means to dictate, which requires considerable time. In the following circumstantial clause is found the participle בַּתְּבֵב, while I was writing and so I myself was doing nothing else all the time than writing down what was dictated. Some commentators have found a stumbling-block in מִפְנֵי in the question of the princes (ver. 17) the LXX. and Ewald omit this word, inasmuch as Baruch does not explain till afterwards that he had written down the words from the mouth of Jeremiah. Others, like Venema, take מִפְנֵי as a question = הַמִּפְנֵי. Both explanations are arbitrary and unnecessary. The princes knew quite well that the substance of the book was from the mouth of Jeremiah, i.e. contained his addresses; but Baruch, too, might have composed the book from the oral discourses of the prophet without being commissioned by him, without his knowledge also, and against his will. Accordingly, to attain certainty as to the share of the prophet in this matter, they ask him, and Baruch answers that Jeremiah had dictated it to him.—Ver. 19. Thereupon the princes advised Baruch to hide himself and Jeremiah; for they knew beforehand that Jehoiakim would put to death the witnesses of the truth.

Vers. 20-26. *The reading of the book before the king.*—Ver. 20. The princes betook themselves to the king **חצרה**, into the inner fore-court (leaving the book-roll in the chamber of the secretary of state), and gave him an account of the matter. **חצרה** is the inner court of the palace, in which the royal dwelling-apartments are situated. **הפקיד**, to entrust a thing or person to any one (xl. 7), hence to deposit, preserve, Isa. x. 28.—Ver. 21. Thereupon the king makes Jehudi fetch the book, and causes it to be read before himself and the assembled princes. **עמד** **לעב**, to stand over, since the one who is standing before his master, while the latter is sitting, overtops him; cf. Gen. xviii. 8. The king was sitting, as is stated in ver. 22 by way of preparation for what follows, in the winter-house, *i.e.* in that portion of the palace which was erected for a winter residence, in the ninth month, *i.e.* during the winter, and the pot of coals was burning before him. The rooms of eastern houses have no stoves, but in the middle of the floor there is a depression, in which is placed a sort of basin with burning coals, for the purpose of heating the apartment: cf. Keil's *Bibl. Archäol.* ii. § 95, S. 7. For the expression **חננתהן**, “and as for the fire-pot, it was burning before him,” cf. Ewald, § 277, d.—Ver. 23. Now, “when Jehudi had read three or four columns, he [the king] cut it [the book-roll] with the pen-knife and threw [the pieces] into the fire, in the pot of coals, till the whole roll was consumed on the fire in the pot of coals.” **נילז**, properly “doors,” are not leaves, but divisions of a book. The opinion of Hitzig, that leaves are to be understood, and that the *Megillah*, therefore, was not a roll, properly speaking, but a book with leaves, cannot be substantiated. In the synagogues, the Jews even at the present day, according to the ancient custom, use real rolls, which are rolled up on a stick. On these the Scripture text is written, though not in lines which occupy the whole breadth of the roll; the whole space is divided into parts. “*Scribebatur*,” says Buxtorf in *Institutione epistolari Hebr.* p. 4, “*volumen lineis, non per longitudinem totius chartæ aut per gamenti deductis, sed in plures areas divisis, quomodo sunt latera paginarum in libris complicatis. Istæ propterea voce metaphoricâ vocantur נילז januæ valvæ, quod figuram januæ referant.*” The subject of **נילז** is not Jehudi, as Hitzig thinks, but the

king, and the word does not signify “he cut it out,” but “he cut it in pieces” (the suffix refers to **הַפִּגְלָה**). We are not, with many expositors, to view the conduct of the king in such a way as to think that, whenever Jehudi had read some portions, he cut these off and threw them into the fire, so that the book with these interruptions, read through to the end, and at the same time gradually destroyed. Such conduct Graf justly characterizes as trifling and silly, and not in harmony with the anger of a king having a violent disposition. But we cannot see how the imperfect **יִקְרַע** (in Nägelsbach’s opinion) proves that Jehudi read the whole, when the text states that only three or four columns were read. The meaning, peculiar to the imperfect, of the continuation or repetition of an act, is fully made out by supposing that the king cut down the roll bit by bit, and threw the pieces into the fire one after the other. Neither does the expression **עַד־תָּהִגְלָה** imply that the whole book was read; for **תָּהִגְלָה** does not denote the completion of the reading, but the completion of the burning: hence the words are to be translated, “till the whole roll had completely gone upon the fire,” i.e. was completely burnt; cf. **אָלַף תָּהִגְלָה**, Gen. xlv 18. The inf. absol. **וְיַעֲשֵׂה** is a continuation of the finite verb as frequently occurs, e.g. in xiv. 5, xxxii. 44.—Ver. 24 f. In order to characterize the conduct of the king, the writer remarks “Yet the king and his servants who heard all these words (which Jehudi had read) were not afraid, nor did they rent their garments (in token of deep sorrow); and even when Elnathan, Delaiah, and Gemariah addressed the king, requesting him not to burn the roll, he did not listen to them.” How hardened was the king, that he and his servants neither were terrified by the threatenings of the prophet, nor felt deep sorrow as Josiah did in a similar case (2 Kings xxii. 11, cf. 1 Kin. xxi. 27), nor did they listen to the earnest representations of the princes. **עֲבָרִי** are the court-attendants of the king in contrast with the princes, who, according to ver. 16, had been alarmed by what they heard read, and wished, by entreaties, to keep the king from the commission of such a wicked act as the destruction of the book. Ewald, on the contrary, has identified **עֲבָרִי** with the princes, and thereby marred the whole account while he reproaches the princes with “acting as the wretch

instruments of what they knew to be the sentiments prevailing at court."—Ver. 26. Not content with destroying the book, Jehoiakim also wished to get Baruch and Jeremiah out of the way; for he ordered the king's son Jerahmeël and two other men to go for Baruch the scribe and Jeremiah the prophet; "but the Lord hid them," *i.e.* graciously kept them out of the sight of the spies. **בָּנֵי הַפְּלִישָׁה** is not the son of Jehoiakim,—if so, we would find simply **אֶחָת-בְּנֵי**; but a royal prince is meant, cf. xxxviii. 6, 1 Kings xxii. 26, 2 Kings xi. 1, 2, Zeph. i. 8.

Vers. 27-32. *The punishment which is to come on Jehoiakim for his wicked act.*—Ver. 27 ff. After the burning of the roll by the king, Jeremiah received from the Lord the command to get all that had been on the former roll written on another, and to announce the following to Jehoiakim the king: Ver. 29. "Thus saith Jahveh: Thou hast burned this roll, whilst thou sayest, Why hast thou written thereon, The king of Babylon shall surely come and destroy this land, and root out man and beast from it? Ver. 30. Therefore thus saith Jaliveh regarding Jehoiakim the king of Jndah: He shall not have one who sits upon the throne of David, and his corpse shall be cast forth to the heat by day and to the frost by night. Ver. 31. And I shall punish him, his servants, and his seed for their iniquity, and bring on them and on all the inhabitants of Judah and all the men of Judah all the evil which I have spoken to them; but they did not hear." On the meaning of ver. 29b see p. 94, *supra*. The threatening expressed in ver. 30 f. is really only a repetition of what is given in xxii. 18, 19, and has already been explained there. "There shall not be to him one who sits upon the throne of David," *i.e.* he is not to have a son that shall occupy the throne of David after him. This does not contradict the fact that, after his death, his son Jehoiachin ascended the throne. For this ascension could not be called a sitting on the throne, a reign, inasmuch as he was immediately besieged in Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and compelled to surrender after three months, then go into exile to Babylon. On ver. 31 cf. xxxv. 17, xix. 15.—Ver. 22. Thereupon Jeremiah made his attendant Baruch write all the words of the former roll on a new one, "out of his mouth," *i.e.* at his dictation; and to these he added many other words like them.

בְּרִרְתָּה, *i.e.* of like import with those on the previous roll. Hence we perceive that on the first roll there were written down not all the several addresses fully, but only the most important parts of his oral announcements.

B. EXPERIENCES AND UTTERANCES OF JEREMIAH DURING THE SIEGE AND CAPTURE OF JERUSALEM.—CHAPTER XXXVII.—XXXIX.

Chap. xxxvii. *Declaration regarding the Issue of the Siege Imprisonment of Jeremiah and Conversation with the King.*

Vers. 1–10. The account of what befell Jeremiah and what he did during the last siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldean until the taking of the city, is introduced, vers. 1 and 2, with the general remark that Zedekiah,—whom Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon had made king in the land of Judah in place of Coniah (on which name see on xxii. 24),—when he became king, did not listen to the words of the Lord through Jeremiah neither himself, nor his servants (officers), nor the people of the land (the population of Judah). Then follows, vers. 3–10, declaration of the prophet regarding the issue of the siege, which he sent to the king by the messengers who were to beseech him for his intercession with the Lord. Vers. 3–5. The occasion of this declaration was the following: Zedekiah sent to Jeremiah two of his chief officers, Jehucal the son of Shelemiah (see on xxxviii. 1), and Zephaniah the son of Maaseiah, the priest (see on xxi. 1 and xxix. 25), with this charge: “Pray now for us to Jahveh our God.” This message was sent to Jeremiah while he still went in and out among the people, and had not yet been put in prison (כְּלֵיאָה, ver. 4 and lii. 31, an unusual form of כְּלָאָה, vers. 15 and 18, for which the *Qeri* would have us in both instances read כְּלָאָה); the army of Pharaoh (Hophra, xliv. 30) too, had marched out of Egypt to oppose the Chaldeans; and the latter, when they heard the report of them (מִצְרַיִם, the news of their approach), had withdrawn from Jerusalem (לְעַזְבֵּתָה, see on xxi. 2), viz. in order to repulse the Egyptians. Both these circumstances are mentioned for the purpose of giving a clear view of the state of things: (a) Jeremiah's freedom to go

and out, not to prepare us for his imprisonment afterwards, but to explain the reason why the king sent two chief officers of the realm to him, whereas, after his imprisonment, he caused him to be brought (cf. ver. 17 with xxxviii. 14); and (b) the approach of the Egyptians joined with the raising of the siege, because this event seemed to afford some hope that the city would be saved.—This occurrence, consequently, falls within a later period than that mentioned in chap. xxi.—Ver. 6. Then came the word of the Lord to this effect: Ver. 7. “Thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel: Thus shall ye say to the king of Judah who hath sent you to me to ask at me, Behold, the army of Pharaoh, which marched out to your help, will return to Egypt, their own land. Ver. 8. And the Chaldeans shall return and fight against this city, and take it, and burn it with fire. Ver. 9. Thus saith Jahveh: Do not deceive yourselves by thinking, The Chaldeans will quite withdraw from us; for they will not withdraw. Ver. 10. For, even though ye had beaten the whole army of the Chaldeans who are fighting with you, and there remained of them only some who had been pierced through and through, yet they would rise up, every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire.” In order to cut off every hope, the prophet announces that the Egyptians will bring no help, but withdraw to their own land before the Chaldeans who went out to meet them, without having accomplished their object; but then the Chaldeans will return, continue the siege, take the city and burn it. To assure them of this, he adds: “Ye must not deceive yourselves with the vain hope that the Chaldeans may possibly be defeated and driven back by the Egyptians. The destruction of Jerusalem is so certain that, even supposing you were actually to defeat and repulse the Chaldeans, and only some few grievously wounded ones remained in the tents, these would rise up and burn the city.” In לִלְכֹה the inf. abs. is to be observed, as strengthening the idea contained in the verb: “to depart wholly or completely;” לִלְכֹה is here to “depart, withdraw.” אַנְשִׁים in contrast with לִלְכֹה are separate individuals. מִזְקָר, pierced through by sword or lance, *i.e.* grievously, mortally wounded.

Vers. 11-15. *The imprisonment of Jeremiah.*—During the time when the Chaldeans, on account of the advancing army

of Pharaoh, had withdrawn from Jerusalem and raised the siege, "Jeremiah went out of the city to go to the land of Benjamin, in order to bring thence his portion among the people." **הַיִתְ**, in accordance with later usage, for **יָתַת**, as in iii. 9; cf. Ewald, § 345, b. **לְחַלְקָה מִשְׁמָךְ** is explained in various ways. **לְחַלְקָה** for **לְחַלְקָה מִשְׁמָךְ** can scarcely have any other meaning than to share, receive a share; and in connection with **מִשְׁמָךְ**, "to receive a portion thence," not, to receive an inheritance (*Syr., Chald., Vulg.*), for **מִשְׁמָךְ** does not suit this meaning. The LXX. render *τοῦ ἀγοράσαι ἐκεῖθεν*, which Theodoret explains by *πρίσσθαι ἄρτους*. All other explanations have still less in their favour. We must connect **בְּתוּךְ הַעַם** with **לְלִכְתָּה וּנו'**, since it is unsuitable for **לְחַלְקָה**.—Ver. 13. When he was entering the gate of Benjamin, where Jeriah the son of Shelemiah kept watch, the latter seized him, saying, "Thou desirest to go over to the Chaldeans" (**נָפַל אֶל-**, see on xxi. 9). The gate of Benjamin (xxxviii. 7; Zech. xiv. 10) was the north gate of the city, through which ran the road to Benjamin and Ephraim; hence it was also called the gate of Ephraim, 2 Kings xiv. 13, Neh. viii. 16. **בָּעֵל פְּקֻדָּה**, "holder of the oversight," he who kept the watch, or commander of the watch at the gate. "The accusation was founded on the well-known views and opinions of Jeremiah (xxi. 9); but it was mere sophistry, for the simple reason that the Chaldeans were no longer lying before the city" (Hitzig).—Ver. 14. Jeremiah replied: "A lie [= not true; cf. 2 Kings ix. 12]; I am not going over to the Chaldeans. But he gave no heed to him; so Jeriah seized Jeremiah, and brought him to the princes. Ver. 15. And the princes were angry against Jeremiah, and smote him, and put him in prison, in the house of Jonathan the scribe; for they had made it the prison,"—probably because it contained apartments suitable for the purpose. From ver. 16 we perceive that they were subterranean prisons and vaults into which the prisoners were thrust; and from ver. 28 and xxxviii. 26, it is clear that Jeremiah was in a confinement much more severe and dangerous to his life. There he sat many days, *i.e.* a pretty long time.

Vers. 16–21. *Examination of the prophet by the king, and alleviation of his confinement.*—Ver. 16 ff. "When Jeremiah had got into the dungeon and into the vaults, and had sat there

many days, then Zedekiah the king sent and fetched him, and questioned him in his own house (palace) secretly," etc. Ver. 16 is by most interpreters joined with the foregoing, but the words כִּי בָּא do not properly permit of this. For if we take the verse as a further confirmation of הַשְׁרִים, "the princes vented their wrath on Jeremiah, beat him," etc., "for Jeremiah came . . .," then it must be acknowledged that the account would be very long and lumbering. Hence the LXX. have *καὶ ἤλθον*,—some codices, indeed, ὅτι ἤλθον; and Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf would change כִּי בָּא into כִּי בָּא. But the passages, 1 Sam. ii. 21, where כִּי בָּא is supposed to stand for כִּי פָּקַד, and Isa. xxxix. 1, where וַיִּשְׁמַע is thought to have arisen out of עָשָׂה, 2 Kings xx. 12, are not very strong proofs, since there, as here, no error in writing is marked. The Vulgate has *itaque ingressus*; many therefore would change וְ into כִּי; but this also is quite arbitrary. Accordingly, with Rosenmüller, we connect ver. 16 with the following, and take כִּי as a temporal particle; in this, the most we miss is יְ copulative, or יְהִי. In the preceding sentence the prison of the prophet is somewhat minutely described, in order to prepare us for the request that follows in ver. 20. Jeremiah was in a בֵּית־בָּבָר, "house of a pit," cf. Ex. xii. 29, i.e. a subterranean prison, and in חֲנִינָה. This word only occurs here; but in the kindred dialects it means vaults, stalls, shops; hence it possibly signifies here subterranean prison-cells, so that אֶל־חֲנִינָה more exactly determines what is. This meaning of the word is, at any rate, more certain than that given by Eb. Scheid in Rosenmüller, who renders חֲנִינָה by *flexa, curvata*; then, supplying *ligna*, he thinks of the stocks to which the prisoners were fastened.—The king questioned him בְּפָנָיו, "in secret," namely, through fear of his ministers and court-officers, who were prejudiced against the prophet, perhaps also in the hope of receiving in a private interview a message from God of more favourable import. To the question of the king, "Is there any word from Jahveh?" Jeremiah replies in the affirmative; but the word of God is this, "Thou shalt be given into the hand of the king of Babylon," just as Jeremiah had previously announced to him; cf. xxxii. 4, xxxiv. 3.—Jeremiah took this opportunity of complain-

ing about his imprisonment, saying, ver. 18, “ In what have I sinned against thee, or against thy servants, or against this people, that ye have put me in prison ? ” Ver. 19. And where are your prophets, who prophesied to you, The king of Babylon shall not come against you, nor against this land ? ” Jeremiah appeals to his perfect innocence (ver. 18), and to the confirmation of his prediction by its event. The interview with the king took place when the Chaldeans, after driving the Egyptians out of the country, had recommenced the siege of Jerusalem, and, as is evident from ver. 21, were pressing the city very hard. The *Kethib* וְנָא is to be read וְנָא, formed from וְנָא with the suffix i; the idea of the suffix has gradually become obscured, so that it stands here before a noun in the plural. The *Qeri* requires וְנָא. The question, Where are your prophets ? means, Let these prophets come forward and vindicate their lying prophecies. Not what these men had prophesied, but what Jeremiah had declared had come to pass ; his imprisonment, accordingly, was unjust.—Besides thus appealing to his innocence, Jeremiah, ver. 20, entreats the king, “ Let my supplication come before thee, and do not send me back into the house of Jonathan the scribe, that I may not die there.” For 'תְּפִלְנָא חַנְכָה see on xxxvi. 7. The king granted this request. “ He commanded, and they put Jeremiah into the court of the watch [of the royal palace, see on xxxii. 2], and gave him a loaf of bread daily out of the bakers’ street, till all the bread in the city was consumed ; ” cf. lii. 6. The king did not give him his liberty, because Jeremiah held to his views, that were so distasteful to the king (see on xxxii. 3). “ So Jeremiah remained in the court of the guard.”

Chap. xxxviii. *Jeremiah in the Miry Pit. Last Interview with the King.*

In this chapter two events are mentioned which took place in the last period of the siege of Jerusalem, shortly before the capture of the city by the Chaldeans. According to ver. 4, the number of fighting men had now very much decreased ; and according to ver. 19, the number of deserters to the Chaldeans had become large. Moreover, according to ver. 9, famine had already begun to prevail ; this hastened the fall of the city.

Vers. 1-13. Jeremiah is cast into a miry pit, but drawn out again by Ebedmelech the Cushite. Vers. 1-6. Being confined in the court of the guard attached to the royal palace, Jeremiah had opportunities of conversing with the soldiers stationed there and the people of Judah who came thither (cf. ver. 1 with xxxii. 8, 12), and of declaring, in opposition to them, his conviction (which he had indeed expressed from the beginning of the siege) that all resistance to the Chaldeans would be fruitless, and only bring destruction (cf. xxi. 9 f.). On this account, the princes who were of a hostile disposition towards him were so embittered, that they resolved on his death, and obtain from the king permission to cast him into a deep pit with mire at the bottom. In ver. 1 four of these princes are named, two of whom, Jucal the son of Shelemiah, and Pashur the son of Malachiah, are known, from xxxvii. 3 and xxi. 1, as confidants of the king; the other two, Shephatiah the son of Mattan, and Gedaliah the son of Pashur, are not mentioned elsewhere. Gedaliah was probably a son of the Pashur who had once put Jeremiah in the stocks (xx. 1, 2). The words of the prophet, vers. 2, 3, are substantially the same as he had already uttered at the beginning of the siege, xxi. 9 (יהה as in xxi. 9). Ver. 4. The princes said to the king, “Let this man, we beseech thee, be put to death [for the construction, see on xxxv. 14]; for therefore [i.e. because no one puts him out of existence, — עליון as in xxix. 28] he weakens the hands of the men of war who remain in this city, and the hands of all the people, by speaking words like these to them; for this man does not seek the welfare of this people, but their ill.” מִרְפֵּא for מִרְפָּה, to cause the hands of any one to be relaxed, i.e. to make him dispirited; cf. Ezra iv. 4, Isa. xxxv. 3. קָרְשׁ with ל, as Job x. 6, Dent. xii. 30, 1 Chron. xxii. 19, etc., elsewhere with the accusativeל; cf. xxix. 7 *et passim*. On this point cf. xxix. 7. The allegation which the princes made against Jeremiah was possibly correct. The constancy with which Jeremiah declared that resistance was useless, since, in accordance with the divine decree, Jerusalem was to be taken and burnt by the Chaldeans, could not but make the soldiers and the people unwilling any longer to sacrifice their lives in defending the city. Nevertheless the complaint was unjust, because Jeremiah was not ex-

pressing his own personal opinion, but was declaring the word of the Lord, and that, too, not from any want of patriotism or through personal cowardice, but in the conviction, derived from the divine revelation, that it was only by voluntary submission that the fate of the besieged could be mitigated; hence he acted from a deep feeling of love to the people, and in order to avert complete destruction from them. The courage of the people which he sought to weaken was not a heroic courage founded on genuine trust in God, but carnal obstinacy, which could not but lead to ruin.—Ver. 5. The king said, “Behold, he is in your hand, for the king can do nothing alongside of you.” This reply indicates not merely the weakness and powerlessness of the king against his princes, but also his inward aversion to the testimony of the man of God. “That he would like to save him, just as he afterwards does (ver. 10),” is not implied in what he says, with which he delivers up the prophet to the spite of his enemies. Though the princes had at once put Jeremiah to death, the king would not even have been able to reproach them. The want of courage vigorously to oppose the demand of the princes did not spring from any kindly feeling towards the prophet, but partly from moral weakness of character, partly from inward repugnance to the word of God proclaimed by Jeremiah. On the construction **אֵין יָבֵל** instead of the participle from **בָּל**, which does not occur, cf. Ewald, § 321, a. **אַתֶּכְם** is certainly in form an accusative; but it cannot be such, since **בְּכֶר** follows as the accusative: it is therefore either to be pointed **אַתֶּכְם** or to be considered as standing for it, just as **אַתְּתָּח** often occurs for **אַתָּה**, “with,” i.e. “along with you.”—Ver. 6. The princes (**שָׂרִים**) now cast Jeremiah into the pit of the king’s son (**בֶּן-מָלְכָה**, see on xxxvi. 26) Malchiah, which was in the court of the prison, letting him down with ropes into the pit, in which there was no water, but mud; into this Jeremiah sank. The act is first mentioned in a general way in the words, “they cast him into the pit;” then the mode of proceeding is particularized in the words, “and they let him down,” etc. On the expression **הַבּוֹרֶה מִלְכִיָּה**, “the pit of Malchiah,” cf. Ewald, § 290, d: the article stands here before the *nomen regens*, because the *nomen rectum*, from being a proper name, cannot take it; and yet the pit must be pointed out as

one well known and definite. That it was very deep, and that Jeremiah must have perished in it if he were not soon taken out again, is evident from the very fact that they were obliged to use ropes in letting him down, and still more so from the trouble caused in pulling him out (vers. 10-12). That the princes did not at once put the prophet to death with the sword was not owing to any feeling of respect for the king, because the latter had not pronounced sentence of death on him, but because they sought to put the prophet to a painful death, and yet at the same time wished to silence the voice of conscience with the excuse that they had not shed his blood.—Vers. 7-13. The deliverance of Jeremiah. Ebedmelech the Cushite, a eunuch, heard of what had happened to Jeremiah. אֲישׁ סִרְם signifies a eunuch: the אֲישׁ shows that סִרְם is here to be taken in its proper meaning, not in the metaphorical sense of an officer of the court. Since the king had many wives (ver. 22 f.), the presence of a eunuch at the court, as overseer of the harem, cannot seem strange. The law of Moses, indeed, prohibited castration (Deut. xxiii. 2); but the man was a foreigner, and had been taken by the king into his service as one castrated. עֲבָד מִלְכָה is a proper name (otherwise it must have been written הַמִּלְכָה); the name is a genuine Hebrew one, and probably may have been assumed when the man entered the service of Zedekiah.—On hearing of what had occurred, the Ethiopian went to the king, who was sitting in the gate of Benjamin, on the north wall of the city, which was probably the point most threatened by the besiegers, and said to him, Ver. 9, “My lord, O king, these men have acted wickedly in all that they have done to Jeremiah the prophet, whom they have cast into the pit; and he is dying of hunger on the spot, for there is no more bread in the city.” הַרְעֵא אֲחֵשֶׁר עָשָׂו, *lit.*: “they have done wickedly what they have done.” וַיָּמָת cannot be translated, “and he died on the spot,” for Ebedmelech wishes to save him before he dies of hunger. But neither does it stand for וַיָּמָת, “so that he must die.” The imperfect with Vav consecutive expresses the consequence of a preceding act, and usually stands in the narrative as a historic tense; but it may also declare what necessarily follows or will follow from what precedes; cf. Ewald, § 342, a. Thus וַיָּמָת stands here in the sense, “and so he is

dying," *i.e.* "he must die of hunger." **מִתְחַנֵּן**, "on his spot," *i.e.* on the place where he is; cf. 2 Sam. ii. 23. The reason, "for there is no longer any bread (**הַלְּחֵם** with the article, the necessary bread) in the city," is not to be taken in the exact sense of the words, but merely expresses the greatest deficiency in provisions. As long as Jeremiah was in the court of the prison, he received, like the officers of the court, at the king's order, his ration of bread every day (xxxvii. 21). But after he had been cast into the pit, that royal ordinance no longer applied to him, so that he was given over to the tender mercies of others, from whom, in the prevailing scarcity of bread, he had not much to hope for.—Ver. 10. Then the king commanded the Ethiopian, "Take hence thirty men in thine hand, and bring up Jeremiah out of the pit before he dies." **בִּידְךָ**, "in thine hand," *i.e.* under your direction; cf. Num. xxxi. 49. The number thirty has been found too great; and Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf would read **שְׁלֵשִׁים**, because the syntax requires the singular **שִׁשָּׁה** after **שְׁלֵשִׁים**, and because at that time, when the fighting men had already decreased in number (ver. 4), thirty men could not be sent away from a post in danger without difficulty. These two arguments are quite invalid. The syntax does not demand **שִׁשָּׁה**; for with the tens (20–90) the noun frequently follows in the plural as well as in the singular, if the number precede; cf. 2 Sam. iii. 20, 2 Kings ii. 16, etc.; see also Gesenius' *Grammar*, § 120, 2. The other argument is based on arbitrary hypotheses; for the passage neither speaks of fighting men, nor states that they would be taken from a post in danger. Ebedmelech was to take thirty men, not because they would all be required for drawing out the prophet, but for making surer work in effecting the deliverance of the prophet, against all possible attempts on the part of the princes or of the populace to prevent them.—Ver. 11. Ebedmelech took the men at his hand, went into the king's house under the treasury, and took thence rags of torn and of worn-out garments, and let them down on ropes to Jeremiah into the pit, and said to him, "Put, I pray thee, the rags of the torn and cast-off clothes under thine arm-pits under the ropes." Jeremiah did so, and then they drew him out of the pit by the ropes. **חֵתֶת הַאֲזֹר** is a room under the treasury. **בְּלֹאִים**, **בְּלִי**, in ver. 12, from **בְּלָה**,

to be worn away (of clothes), are rags. **סַחְבּוֹת** (from **סַחְבּ**, to drag, drag about, tear to pieces) are torn pieces of clothing. **מַלְחִים**, worn-out garments, from **מַלְחָ**, in Niphal, Isa. li. 6, to vanish, dissolve away. The article at **הַסַּחְבּוֹת** is expunged from the *Qeri* for sake of uniformity, because it is not found with **מַלְחִים**; but it may as well be allowed to stand as be removed. **אַשְׁלָוֹת** **יָדִים**, properly the roots of the hands, are not the knuckles of the hand, but the shoulders of the arms. **מַתְחַת** **לְחֶבְלִים**, under the ropes; *i.e.* the rags were to serve as pads to the ropes which were to be placed under the arm-pits, to prevent the ropes from cutting the flesh. When Jeremiah had been drawn out in this way from the deep pit of mire, he remained in the court of the prison.

Vers. 14-28. *Conversation between the king and the prophet.*—Ver. 14. King Zedekiah was desirous of once more hearing a message of God from the prophet, and for this object had him brought into the third entrance in the house of the Lord. Nothing further is known about the situation and the nature of this entrance; possibly it led from the palace to the temple, and seems to have been an enclosed space, for the king could carry on a private conversation there with the prophet. The king said to him, “I ask you about a matter, do not conceal anything from me.” He meant a message from God regarding the final issue of the siege, cf. xxxvii. 7. Jeremiah, knowing the aversion of the king to the truth, replies, ver. 15: “If I tell thee [*sc.* the word of the Lord], wilt thou not assuredly kill me? And if I were to give thee advice, thou wouldest not listen to me.” Ver. 16. Then the king sware to him secretly, “As Jahveh liveth, who hath made us this soul, I shall certainly not kill thee, nor deliver thee into the hand of these men who seek thy life.” **אֶת אָשֶׁר**, as in xxvii. 8, properly means, “with regard to Him who has created us.” The *Qeri* expunges **תְּ**. “These men” are the princes mentioned in ver. 1.—Ver. 17 f. After this solemn asseveration of the king, Jeremiah said to him, “Thus saith Jahveh, the God of hosts, the God of Israel: If thou wilt assuredly go out to the princes of the king of Babylon [*i.e.* wilt surrender thyself to them, cf. 2 Kings xviii. 31, xxiv. 12], then thy soul shall live, and this city shall not be burned with fire, and thou and thy house shall live. But if thou dost

not go out to the princes of the king of Babylon, then this city will be given into the hand of the Chaldeans, and they shall burn it with fire, and thou shalt not escape out of their hand.” The word of God is the same that Jeremiah had already repeatedly announced to the king, cf. xxxiv. 2–5, xxxii. 4, xxi. 4–10. The princes (chiefs, generals) of the king of Babylon are named, because they commanded the besieging army (xxxix. 3, 13); Nebuchadnezzar himself had his headquarters at Riblah, xxxix. 5.—Ver. 19 ff. Against the advice that he should save his life by surrendering to the Chaldeans, Zedekiah suggests the consideration, “I am afraid of the Jews, who have deserted [לְנַפְשֵׁךְ] as in xxxvii. 13] to the Chaldeans, lest they give me into their hands and maltreat me.” *אֶלְעָנָה, illudere alicui*, to abuse any one by mockery or ill-treatment; cf. Num. xxii. 29, 1 Chron. x. 4, etc. Jeremiah replies, ver. 20 f., “They will not give thee up. Yet, pray, listen to the voice of Jahveh, in that which I say to thee, that it may be well with thee, and that thy soul may live. Ver. 21. But if thou dost refuse to go out [*i.e.* to surrender thyself to the Chaldeans], this is the word which the Lord hath shown me [has revealed to me]: Ver. 22. Behold, all the women that are left in the house of the king of Judah shall be brought out to the princes of the king of Babylon, and those [women] shall say, Thy friends have misled thee and have overcome thee; thy feet are sunk in the mud, they have turned away back. Ver. 23. And all thy wives and thy children shall they bring out to the Chaldeans, and thou shalt not escape out of their hand; for thou shalt be seized by the hand of the king of Babylon, and thou shalt burn this city with fire.”—After Jeremiah had once more assured the king that he would save his life by voluntary surrender, he announces to him that, on the other alternative, instead of his becoming the sport of the deserters, the women of his harem would be insulted. The women who remain in the king’s house, as distinguished from “thy wives” (ver. 23), are the women of the royal harem, the wives of former kings, who remain in the harem as the concubines of the reigning king. These are to be brought out to the generals of the Chaldean king, and to sing a satire on him, to this effect: “Thy friends have misled thee, and overpowered thee,” etc. The first sentence of this

song is from Obad. ver. 7, where **הַשִּׁיאוֹךְ** stands instead of **הַפִּיתְגָּה**. The friends (**אֱנֶשֶׁי שָׁלֹמֶךְ**, cf. xx. 10) are his great men and his false prophets. Through their counsels, these have led him astray, and brought him into a bog, in which his feet stick fast, and then they have gone back; *i.e.* instead of helping him out, they have deserted him, leaving him sticking in the bog. The expression is figurative, and the meaning of the figure is plain (**רִגְלָיו** is plural). בָּצָר, ἀπ. λεγ., is equivalent to בָּצָה, a bog, Job viii. 11. Moreover, the wives and children of Zedekiah are to fall into the hands of the Chaldeans. מִזְצָאִים, the participle, is used instead of the finite tense to express the notion of indefinite personality: “they bring them out.” תִּתְחַטֵּשׁ בַּיד, properly, “to be seized in the hand,” is a pregnant construction for, “to fall into the hand and be held fast by it.” “Thou shalt burn this city,” *i.e.* bring the blame of burning it upon thyself. Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf, following the LXX., Syr., and Chald., would change תִּשְׁרַף into תִּשְׁלַח, but needlessly.—Vers. 24-27. From the king’s weakness of character, and his dependence on his evil counsellors, neither could this interview have any result. Partly from want of firmness, but chiefly from fear of the reproaches of his princes, he did not venture to surrender himself and the city to the Chaldeans. Hence he did not wish that his interview with the prophet should be known, partly for the purpose of sparing himself reproaches from the princes, partly also, perhaps, not to expose the prophet to further persecutions on the part of the great men. Accordingly, he dismissed Jeremiah with this instruction: “Let no man know of these words, lest thou die.” But if the princes should learn that the king had been speaking with him, and asked him, “Tell us, now, what thou hast said to the king, do not hide it from us, and we will not kill thee; and what did the king say to thee?” then he was to say to them, “I presented my supplication before the king, that he would not send me back to the house of Jonathan, to die there.” As to the house of Jonathan, see on xxxvii. 15. On מִפְּלֵל תְּחִנְמֵה cf. xxxvi. 7, xxxvii. 20.—Vers. 27, 28. What the king had supposed actually occurred, and Jeremiah gave the princes, who asked about the conversation, the reply that the king had prepared for him. תְּחִרְשֵׁו מִטְמֵן, they went away in silence from him, and left him in peace; cf. 1 Sam. vii. 8. **כִּי לֹא נִשְׁמַע הָנָכְרָר**, for

the matter, the real subject of the conversation did not become known. So Jeremiah remained in the court of the prison till the day of the capture of Jerusalem.—The last sentence of ver. 28 belongs to the following chapter, and forms the introductory sentence of the passage whose conclusion follows in xxxix. 3.

Chap. xxxix. *Capture of Jerusalem; Fate of Zedekiah and Jeremiah. Consolatory Message to Ebedmelech.*

In vers. 1–14 the events which took place at the taking of Jerusalem are summarily related, for the purpose of showing how the announcements of Jeremiah the prophet have been fulfilled.¹

Vers. 1–3. “And it came to pass, when Jerusalem had been taken (in the ninth year of Zedekiah the king of Judah, in

¹ The greater portion of the section vers. 1–14 is set down by Movers, Hitzig, Ewald, and Graf as the interpolation of a later glosser, compiled either out of chap. lii. 4–16, or from 2 Kings xxv. Vers. 3, 11, 12, and 14 are supposed by Hitzig to be all that are genuine, on the ground that these are the only portions containing independent statements, not derived from any other source. They treat simply of the person of the prophet, and state how, at the command of Nebuchadnezzar, *Nebuzaradan*, the captain of the body-guard, brought Jeremiah out of the court of the prison and delivered him over to the care of Gedaliah. If we gather together the verses that are left as genuine, we find, of course, that the subject treated of in them is what occurred when Jeremiah was liberated from his confinement in the court of the prison. But neither is the difference between ver. 14 and chap. xl. 1 ff. thereby settled, nor the difficulty removed, that Nebuzaradan, the captain of the body-guard, was not present with the army when Jerusalem was taken; according to lii. 12, it was not till a month after that event that he was sent to Jerusalem from Riblah by the king, who was staying there. Vers. 11 and 12, too, retain the appearance of being interpolations. Ewald and Graf, accordingly, consider these two verses also as later insertions. But even this view does not settle the differences and difficulties that have been raised, but only increases them; for it would represent Jeremiah as being set at liberty, not by Nebuzaradan, as is related xl. 1 ff., but by the Chaldean generals named in ver. 3.—When, however, we inquire into the grounds taken as the foundation of this hypothesis, the fact that the LXX. have omitted vers. 4, 10, and 13 can prove nothing, since vers. 1 and 2 are found in the LXX., although these also are supposed to be spurious. The only argument adduced for the attempted excision, viz. that vers. 1, 2, 4–10 break the connection, proves absolutely nothing in itself, but merely receives importance on the

the tenth month, Nebuchadrezzar and all his army had come against Jerusalem and besieged it; in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, in the fourth month, on the ninth of the month, was the city broken into), then came all the princes of the king of Babylon and sat down at the middle gate,—Nergal-sharezer, Samgar-nebo, Sarsechim, chief chamberlain, Nergal-sharezer, chief magician, and all the rest of the princes of the king of Babylon.” These three verses, to which the last clause of chap. xxxviii. 28 belongs, form one period, broken up by a pretty long piece inserted in it, on the beginning and duration of the siege of Jerusalem; so that, after the introductory clause (וְהִיא בָּאָשָׁר = as in xxxvii. 11), chap. xxxviii. 28, the conclusion does not come till the word וְיָבֹא, ver. 3. In the parenthesis, the length of the siege, as stated, substantially agrees with lii. 4-7a and 2 Kings xxv. 1-4a, only that in these passages

supposition that the present section could only treat of the liberation of Jeremiah, and must contain nothing that is mentioned elsewhere regarding the taking of Jerusalem. But this supposition is quite unwarranted. That vers. 1 and 2 are inserted parenthetically cannot afford any ground of suspicion as regards their genuineness; and that, in vers. 4-10, mention is briefly made of Zedekiah’s being seized and condemned, of the destruction of Jerusalem, and the carrying away of the people, except the very meanest, —this also cannot throw suspicion on the genuineness of these verses; for these statements obviously aim at showing how the word of the Lord, which Jeremiah had proclaimed repeatedly, and once more a short time before the storming of the city, had been fulfilled. Finally, it follows from this that these statements agree with those given in chap. lii. and in 2 Kings xxv. regarding the capture and destruction of Jerusalem; but it does not follow that they have been derived from the latter as their source. The language in the disputed verses is peculiarly that of Jeremiah. The expression פֶּלֶתְּרִי יְהִזְקָה is found in Jer. xxvii. 20; while in lii. 10, instead of it, we find פֶּלֶתְּרִי יְהִזְקָה, and in 2 Kings xxv. the whole sentence is wanting. So, also, רַבֵּר מִשְׁפָטִים, ver. 5 and lii. 9, is an expression peculiar to Jeremiah (see on i. 16); in 2 Kings xxv. 6 it is changed to רַבֵּר מִשְׁפָט. Thus we must set down as groundless and erroneous the allegation made by Hitzig and Graf, that these verses of our chapter have been derived from 2 Kings xxv.; for the form of the name Nebuchadnezzar (with *n*) in ver. 5 instead of Nebuchadrezzar, which agrees with 2 Kings xxv., and which has been brought to bear on this question, can prove nothing, just because not only in ver. 11 but also in ver. 1 (which also is said to be taken from 2 Kings xxv.) we find Nebuchadrezzar.

the time when the siege began is further determined by the mention of the day of the month, בְּשֹׁנֶר לְחֶדֶשׁ, which words are omitted here. The siege, then, lasted eighteen months, all but one day. After the besiegers had penetrated into the city through the breaches made in the wall, the princes, *i.e.* the chief generals, took up their position at “the gate of the midst.” שָׁבֵן, “they sat down,” *i.e.* took up a position, fixed their quarters. “The gate of the midst,” which is mentioned only in this passage, is supposed, and perhaps rightly, to have been a gate in the wall which divided the city of Zion from the lower city; from this point, the two portions of the city, the upper and the lower city, could most easily be commanded.—With regard to the names of the Babylonian princes, it is remarkable (1) that the name Nergal-sharezer occurs twice, the first time without any designation, the second time with the official title of chief magician; (2) that the name Samgar-nebo has the name of God (Nebo or Nebu) in the second half, whereas in all other compounds of this kind that are known to us, Nebu forms the first portion of the name, as in Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuzaradan, Nebushasban (ver. 13), Naboned, Nabonassar, Nabopolassar, etc.; (3) from this name, too, is omitted the title of office, while we find one with the following name. Moreover (4) in ver. 13, where the Babylonian grandees are again spoken of, instead of the four names, only three are given, but every one of them with a title of office; and only the third of these, Nergal-sharezer, the chief magician, is identical with the one who is named last in ver. 3; while Nebushasban is mentioned instead of the Sarsechim of ver. 3 as רָב־סִרִים, chief of the eunuchs (high chamberlain); and in place of Nergal-sharezer, Samgar-nebo, we find Nebuzaradan as the commander of the body-guards (רָב־טְבִיחִים). On these four grounds, Hitzig infers that ver. 3, in the passage before us, has been corrupted, and that it contained originally only the names of three persons, with their official titles. Moreover, he supposes that סְמִינֵר is formed from the Persian جام and the derivation-syllable سِنْه, Pers. سِنْه, and means “he who has or holds the cup,” the cup-bearer; thus corresponding to רָב־שְׁקָה, Rab-shakeh, “chief cup-bearer,” 2 Kings xviii. 17, Isa. xxxvi. 2. He also considers שְׁרִסְכִים a Hebraizing form of

חִצָּה, Arab. **שָׁבַת** or **סָכָה** ; **רַב סָרִים** “to cut,” by transposition from **חִצָּה**, **רַב סָרִים** **שָׁרְסָכִים**, from which comes **חִצִּי**, “a eunuch,” plur. **חִצִּים**, of which the former has been a marginal gloss, afterwards received into the text. This complicated combination, however, by which Hitzig certainly makes out two official titles, though he retains no more than the divine name *Nebu* as that of *Rabsaris*, is founded upon two very hazardous conjectures. Nor do these conjectures gain much support from the renewal of the attempt, made about fifty years since by the late P. von Bohlen, to explain from the Neo-Persian the names of persons and titles occurring in the Assyrian and Old-Babylonian languages, an attempt which has long since been looked upon as scientifically unwarranted. Strange as it may seem that the two persons first named are not further specified by the addition of an official title, yet the supposition that the persons named in ver. 3 are identical with those mentioned in ver. 13 is erroneous, since it stands in contradiction with lii. 12, which even Hitzig recognises as historically reliable. According to lii. 12, Nebuzaradan, who is the first mentioned in ver. 13, was not present at the taking of Jerusalem, and did not reach the city till four weeks afterwards; he was ordered by Nebuchadnezzar to superintend arrangements for the destruction of Jerusalem, and also to make arrangements for the transportation of the captives to Babylon, and for the administration of the country now being laid waste. But in ver. 3 are named the generals who, when the city had been taken by storm, took up their position within it.—Nor do the other difficulties, mentioned above, compel us to make such harsh conjectures. If Nergal-sharezer be the name of a person, compounded of two words, the divine name, *Nergal* (2 Kings xvii. 30), and *Sharezer*, probably *dominator tuebitur* (see Delitzsch on Isa. xxxvii. 38), then Samgar-Nebu-Sarsechim may possibly be a proper name compounded of three words. So long as we are unable with certainty to explain the words **סָמָר** and **שָׁרְסָכִים** out of the Assyrian, we can form no decisive judgment regarding them. But not even does the hypothesis of Hitzig account for the occurrence twice over of the name Nergal-sharezer. The Nergal-sharezer mentioned in the first passage was, no doubt,

the commander-in-chief of the besieging army; but it could hardly be maintained, with anything like convincing power, that this officer could not bear the same name as that of the chief magician. And if it be conceded that there are really errors in the strange words פָּמְפָּרְנָבִי and שִׁרְסָכִים, we are as yet without the necessary means of correcting them, and obtaining the proper text.

In vers. 4-7 are narrated the flight of Zedekiah, his capture, and his condemnation, like what we find in lii. 7-11 and 2 Kings xxv. 4-7. "When Zedekiah the king of Judah and all the men of war saw them (the Chaldean generals who had taken up their position at the mid-gate), they fled by night out of the city, by the way of the king's garden, by a gate between the walls, and he went out by the way to the Arabah. Ver. 5. But the army of the Chaldeans pursued after them, and overtook Zedekiah in the steppes of Jericho, and captured him, and brought him to Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, to Riblah, in the land of Hamath; and he pronounced judgment on him." Hitzig and Graf consider that the connection of these events, made by בְּאַשְׁר רָאָם, is awkward, and say that the king would not have waited till the Chaldean generals took up their position at the mid-gate, nor could he see these in the night-time; that, moreover, he would hardly have waited till the city was taken before he fled. These objections are utterly worthless. If the city of Zion, in which the royal palace stood, was separated from the lower city by a wall, then the king might still be quite at ease, with his men of war, in the upper city or city of Zion, so long as the enemy, who were pushing into the lower city from the north, remained at the separating wall, near the middle gate in it; and only when he saw that the city of Zion, too, could no longer be held, did he need to betake himself to flight with the men of war around him. In actual fact, then, he might have been able to see the Chaldean generals with his own eyes, although we need not press רָאָם so much as to extract this meaning from it. Even at this juncture, flight was still possible through the south gate, at the king's garden, between the two walls. Thenius, on 2 Kings xxv. 4, takes חֲמַתִּים to mean a double wall, which at the southern end of Ophel closed up the ravine between Ophel and Zion. But a double wall must also

have had two gates, and Thenius, indeed, has exhibited them in his plan of Jerusalem; but the text speaks of but one gate (שער). “The two walls” are rather the walls which ran along the eastern border of Zion and the western border of Ophel. The gate between these was situated in the wall which ran across the Tyropœan valley, and united the wall of Zion and that of Ophel; it was called the horse-gate (Neh. iii. 28), and occupied the position of the modern “dung-gate” (*Bab-el Moghâribeh*); see on Neh. iii. 27, 28. It was not the “gate of the fountain,” as Thenius (*Bücher der Kön.* S. 456), Nägelsbach, and others imagine, founding on the supposed existence of the double wall at the south end of Ophel. Outside this gate, where the valley of the Tyropœon joined with the valley of the Kidron, lay the king’s garden, in the vicinity of the pool of Siloam; see on Neh. iii. 15. The words ‘וְיָצָא וְיָבֹרֶךְ’ introduce further details as to the king’s flight. In spite of the preceding plurals אֶחָד וְיָצָא, the sing. אֶחָד is quite suitable here, since the narrator wishes to give further details with regard to the flight of the king alone, without bringing into consideration the warriors who fled along with him. Nor does the following אֶחָד וְיָצָא militate against this view; for the Chaldean warriors pursued the king and his followers, not to capture these followers, but the king. Escaped from the city, the king took the direction of the עֲרָבָה, the plain of the Jordan, in order to escape over Jordan to Gilead. But the pursuing enemy overtook him in the steppes of Jericho (see on Josh. iv. 13, pp. 50, 51 of Clark’s Translation), and thus before he had crossed the Jordan; they led him, bound, to Riblah, before the king of Babylon. “Riblah in the land of Hamath” is still called *Ribleh*, a wretched village about 20 miles S.S.W. from *Hums* (*Emesa*) on the river *el Ahsy* (*Orontes*), in a large fertile plain in the northern portion of the *Bekâa*, on the great caravan-track which passes from Palestine through Damascus, Emesa, and Hamath to Thapsacus and Carchemish on the Euphrates; see Robinson’s *Bibl. Res.* iii. 545, and on 2 Kings xxiii. 33 (vol. ii. p. 160 of Clark’s Translation).—On דָּפֶר מְשֻׁפְטִים, to speak judgment, pronounce sentence of punishment, see on i. 16. Nebuchadnezzar caused the sons of Zedekiah and all the princes of Judah (חֶרְמִים, nobles, lords, as in xxvii. 30) to be slain before the eyes of the Jewish king; then he put out

his eyes and bound him with brazen fetters, to carry him away to Babylon (לְבָבֵיא for לְהַבְּבֵיא), where, according to lii. 11, he remained in confinement till his death.

Vers. 8-10 contain a brief notice regarding the fate of the city of Jerusalem and its inhabitants, joined on to the passage preceding, in order to prepare the way for a short account of the treatment which Jeremiah experienced at the same time. From the more detailed notice regarding the fate of the city, given in lii. 12 ff., 2 Kings xxv. 8 ff., we see that the destruction of the city and the carrying away of the people took place one month after their fall, and that the king of Babylon had appointed Nebuzaradan, the commander of his body-guards, to go to Jerusalem for the purpose of carrying out these matters. In these verses of ours, also, Nebuzaradan is mentioned as the one who carried out the judgment that had been pronounced (ver. 10 ff.); but the fact of his being sent from Riblah and the date of the execution of his commission are here omitted, so that it appears as if it had all occurred immediately after the capture of the city, and as if Nebuzaradan had been always on the spot. For the writer of this chapter did not need to give a historically exact account of the separate events; it was merely necessary briefly to mention the chief points, in order to place in proper light the treatment experienced by the prophet. The Chaldeans burned the king's house (the palace) and בֵּית־הָעָם. This latter expression, taken in connection with "the king's house," signifies the rest of the city apart from the king's palace; hence בֵּית is used in a collective sense. The temple is not mentioned, as being of no consequence for the immediate purpose of this short notice.—Ver. 9. "And the rest of the people that had remained in the city, and the deserters who had deserted to him, and the rest of the people that remained, Nebuzaradan, the chief of the body-guards, led captive to Babylon. Ver. 10. But of the poorest of the people, who had nothing, Nebuzaradan left some in the country, and he gave them vineyards and arable fields at the same time." עַל־נָפָל after נָפָל refers, *ad sensum*, to the king of Babylon; his name, certainly, is not given in the immediate context, but it is readily suggested by it. In lii. 15 we find בָּבָל instead of עַל־מֶלֶךְ; yet we might also refer this last-named word to the following subject, Nebuzaradan, as the

representative of the king. **רָבְּ-טָבְּחִים**, properly, chief of the slayers, *i.e.* of the executioners, is the chief of the king's body-guard, who occupied the first place among the royal attendants; see on Gen. xxxvii. 36. By the addition of the words **בַּיּוֹם** **הַהִיא**, on that day, *i.e.* then, the more general account regarding Jerusalem and its inhabitants is concluded, for the purpose of attaching to it the notice regarding the fate of the prophet Jeremiah, vers. 11-14.

Vers. 11-14. Nebuchadnezzar gave orders regarding Jeremiah, through Nebuzaradan, the chief of the body-guards: "Take him, and set thine eyes upon him, and do him no harm; but, just as he telleth thee, so do with him." In obedience to this command, "Nebuzaradan, the chief of the body-guards, sent,—and Nebushasban the head chamberlain, and Nergal-sharezer the chief magician, and all (the other) chief men of the king of Babylon,—they sent and took Jeremiah out of the court of the prison, and delivered him over to Gedaliah the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, to take him out to the house. Thus he dwelt among the people."—On the names of the Chaldean grandees, see on ver. 3. Instead of the chief chamberlain (**רִבְּ-פָרִים**) Sarsechim, there is here named, as occupying this office, Nebushasban, who, it seems, along with Nebuzaradan, was not sent from Riblah till after the taking of Jerusalem, when Sarsechim was relieved. We cannot come to any certain conclusion regarding the relation in which the two persons or names stand to one another, since Nebushasban is only mentioned in ver. 13, just as Sarsechim is mentioned only in ver. 3. Gedaliah the son of Ahikam, the man who had already on a former occasion given protection to Jeremiah (xxvi. 24), was, according to xl. 5, placed by the king of Babylon over the cities of Judah, *i.e.* was nominated the Chaldean governor over Judah and the Jews who were left in the land. To him, as such, Jeremiah is here (ver. 14) delivered, that he may take him into the house. **בַּיִת** is neither the temple (Hitzig) nor the palace, the king's house (Graf), but the house in which Gedaliah resided as the governor; and we find here **הַבַּיִת**, not **בְּבַיִת**, since the house was neither the property nor the permanent dwelling-place of Gedaliah.—According to this account, Jeremiah seems to have remained in the court of the prison till Nebuchadnezzar

came, to have been liberated by Nebuzaradan only at the command of the king, and to have been sent to Gedaliah the governor. But this is contradicted by the account in xl. 1 ff., according to which, Nebuzaradan liberated the prophet in Ramah, where he had been kept, confined by manacles, among the captives of Judah that were to be carried to Babylon: Nebuzaradan sent for him, and gave him his liberty. This contradiction has arisen simply from the intense brevity with which, in this verse, the fate of Jeremiah at the capture and destruction of Jerusalem is recorded; it is easy to settle the difference in this way:—When the city was taken, those inhabitants, especially males, who had not carried arms, were seized by the Chaldeans and carried out of the city to Ramah, where they were held prisoners till the decision of the king regarding their fate should be made known. Jeremiah shared this lot with his fellow-countrymen. When, after this, Nebuzaradan came to Jerusalem to execute the king's commands regarding the city and its inhabitants, at the special order of his monarch, he sent for Jeremiah the prophet, taking him out from among the crowd of prisoners who had been already carried away to Ramah, loosed him from his fetters, and gave him permission to choose his place of residence. This liberation of Jeremiah from his confinement might, in a summary account, be called a sending for him out of the court of the prison, even though the prophet, at the exact moment of his liberation, was no longer in the court of the prison of the palace at Jerusalem, but had been already carried away to Ramah as a captive.

Vers. 15–18. *Jeremiah's message of comfort to Ebedmelech.*—Ver. 15. “Now to Jeremiah there had come the word of the Lord, while he remained shut up in the court of the prison, as follows: Ver. 16. Go and speak to Ebedmelech the Cushite, saying, Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will bring my words against this city for evil and not for good, and they shall take place before thee on that day. Ver. 17. But I will deliver thee on that day, saith Jahveh; neither shalt thou be given into the hand of the men of whom thou art afraid. Ver. 18. For I will surely save thee, neither shalt thou fall by the sword, and thine own life shall be thy spoil, because thou hast trusted me, saith Jahveh.”—This word of God for Ebed-

melech came to the prophet, no doubt, very soon after his deliverance from the miry pit by this pious Ethiopian ; but it is not given till now, and this by way of supplement, lest its introduction previously should break the chain of events which occurred at the time of that deliverance, chap. xxxviii. 14-xxxix. 13. Hence **חִיָּה**, ver. 15, is to be translated as a pluperfect. "Go and say," etc., is not inconsistent with the fact that Jeremiah, from being in confinement, could not leave the court of the prison. For Ebedmelech could come into the prison, and then Jeremiah could go to him and declare the word of God. "Behold, I will bring my words against this city," i.e. I shall cause the evil with which I have threatened Jerusalem and its inhabitants to come, or, to be accomplished (**מִבָּי** with **א** dropped, as in xix. 15, and **אָלָא** for **לְעַל**). "and these words are to take place before thy face," i.e. thou shalt with thine own eyes behold their fulfilment, **בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא**, i.e. at the time of their occurrence. But thou shalt be saved, not fall into the hands of the enemy and be killed, but carry away thy body out of it all as booty ; cf. xxi. 9, xxxviii. 2. "Because thou hast trusted me ;" i.e. through the aid afforded to my prophet thou hast continued thy faith in me.

C. JEREMIAH'S PREDICTIONS AND EXPERIENCES AFTER THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.—CHAP. XL.—XLV.

Chap. xl. and xli. *Liberation of Jeremiah. Murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael, and its results.*

Chap. xl. 1-6. The *liberation of Jeremiah* by Nebuzaradan, the chief of the body-guards.—The superscription, "The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord, after that Nebuzaradan, the captain of the body-guard, had let him go from Ramah," does not seem to be appropriate ; for in what follows there is no word of God declared by Jeremiah, but first, 2-6, we are told that Jeremiah was liberated and given in charge to Gedaliah ; then is told, xl. 7-xli. 18, the story of the murder of Gedaliah the governor by Ishmael, together with its consequences ; and not till xlvi. 7 ff. is there communicated a word of God, which Jeremiah uttered regarding the Jews who wished to flee to

Egypt, and had besought him for some revelation from God (xlvi. 1-6). The heading of our verse cannot refer to this prophecy, not merely for the reason that it is too far removed, but still more because it has a historical notice introducing it, xlvi. 1-6. Our superscription rather refers to i. 1-3; and **בְּרִית** here, as well as there, means, not a single prophecy, but a number of prophecies. Just as **בְּרִית יְהוָה** in i. 2 forms the heading for all the prophecies uttered by Jeremiah from the thirteenth year of Josiah till the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the people in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, so the words **הַבְּרִית אֲשֶׁר נָוָה** of this verse form the superscription for the prophecies which Jeremiah uttered after the destruction of Jerusalem, *i.e.* to the section formed by chap. xl.-xlv., although chap. xliv. xlv. have headings of their own; these, however, are subordinate to the heading of this chapter, in the same way as the titles in vii. 1, xi. 1, xiv. 1, etc. fall under the general title given in i. 2, 3.—Regarding Nebuzaradan and the discharge of Jeremiah at Ramah (*i.e.* *er Rām*, see on xxxi. 15), cf. the explanations given on xxxix. 13 (p. 124 of this volume). In what follows, from **בְּקָרְבָּהּ** onwards, further details are given regarding Jeremiah's liberation. “When he (Nebuzaradan) sent for him, he (Jeremiah), bound with fetters, was among all the captives of Jerusalem and Judah who were being carried away to Babylon.” Those who were to be carried away had been gathered together to Ramah, which lies about five miles north from Jerusalem; thence they were to set out for Babylon. **אֲנָקִים** (= **אֲנָקִים**, Job xxxvi. 8, Isa. xlv. 14), “fetters,”—here, according to ver. 4, “manacles,” by which, perhaps, two or more prisoners were fastened to one another.—Vers. 2-4. When Jeremiah had been brought, the commander of the guards said to him, “The Lord thy God hath declared this evil against this place, and the Lord hath brought it on (brought it to pass), and hath done as He spake; for ye have sinned against the Lord, and have not hearkened to His voice: thus hath this thing happened to you.” The mode of expression is that of Jeremiah; but Nebuzaradan may have expressed the *thought*, that now there had been fulfilled what Jeremiah had predicted in the name of God, because the people, by their rebellion, had broken the oath they had sworn before their God

(cf. Ezek. xvii. 13 ff.), and had thereby sinned against Him. The article before **בְּ**, required by the *Qeri*, is unnecessary; cf. Ewald, § 293, a; Gesenius, § 112, 2, a.—Ver. 4. Nebuzaradan then declared him free: “And now, behold, I free thee this day from the shackles on thine hands. If it please thee to come with me to Babylon, then come, and I will set mine eye upon thee (*i.e.* take thee under my protection, cf. xxxix. 12). But if it please thee not to come with me to Babylon, then let it be so. See, the whole country is before thee (cf. Gen. xiii. 9, xx. 5, etc.); whithersoever it pleases thee, and seems right to thee to go, go.” Ver. 5. And because Jeremiah had not yet returned, he said, “Go back to Gedaliah, . . . whom the king of Babylon hath set over the cities of Judah, and remain with him among the people; or go wherever it seemeth right to thee to go.” And the commander of the guard gave him what provisions he required and a present, and sent him away; thereafter Jeremiah went to Gedaliah to Mizpah, and remained there among the people who had been left behind in the land (ver. 6). The words **לֹא יָשַׁב עַזְּבָה** were certainly misunderstood by the old translators, who made various conjectures as to their meaning; even yet, Dahler, Movers, Graf, and Nägelsbach are of opinion that “it is impossible to understand” this sentence, and that the text is plainly corrupt. Luther renders: “for no one will any longer return thither.” Hitzig considers this translation substantially correct, and only requiring to be a little more exactly rendered: “but there, no one returns home again.” Apart, however, from the consideration that on this view **עַזְּבָה**, which stands at the head of the sentence, does not get full justice paid to it, the thought does not accord with what precedes, and the reference of the suffix to the indefinite “person” or “one” is extremely forced. According to what goes before, in which Nebuzaradan gives the prophet full liberty of choosing whether he would go with him to Babylon or remain in the country, in whatever part he likes, and from the following advice which he gives him, “Go, or return, to Gedaliah,” the words **לֹא יָשַׁב עַזְּבָה**, on account of the third person (**יָשַׁב**), cannot certainly be an address of the chief captain to Jeremiah, and as little can they contain a remark about going to Babylon. The words are evidently, both as to

their form and their contents, a circumstantial clause, containing a statement regarding the relation of Jeremiah to the proposal of the chief captain (and this is the view taken long ago by Kimchi), *i.e.* a parenthetical remark of the narrator, according to which Nebuzaradan demands that he shall remain with Gedaliah, in the sense, “and yet he was not going back,” or, still better, on account of the imperfect יָשַׁב, “because he was still unwilling to go back,” namely, to this or that place indefinitely; then Nebuzaradan further said, “Return, then, to Gedaliah.” If we supply וַיֹּאמֶר before וְיַשְׁבֶּה וּ, with which Nebuzaradan brings the matter to a close, the meaning is quite clear. It is evident from ver. 4 that Nebuzaradan stopped a little in order to let Jeremiah decide; but since the prophet did not return, *i.e.* neither decided in the one way nor the other, he adds וְיַשְׁבֶּה וּ, and thereby puts an end to the indecision. אֹרֶחֶת means a portion of food, or victuals; cf. lii. 34 and Prov. xv. 17. Mizpah, where Gedaliah had taken up his position, is the Mizpah of the tribe of Benjamin, where Samuel judged the people and chose Saul to be king (1 Sam. vii. 15 ff., x. 17); doubtless the modern *Neby Samwil*, five miles north-west from Jerusalem, a short distance south-west from Ramah; see on Josh. xviii. 26.

Vers. 7-12. *Return of those who had been dispersed: they gather round Gedaliah.*—Whilst the country and its capital were being conquered, many of the men of war had dispersed here and there through the land, and fled for refuge to regions difficult of access, where they could not be reached by the Chaldeans; others had even escaped into the territory of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites. When these heard that now, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the captives, the king of Babylon had appointed Gedaliah as governor over the few people who had been left behind in the country, they returned from their several places of refuge, and came to Mizpah to Gedaliah, who promised them protection and safety, on condition that they would recognise the authority of the king of Babylon and peaceably cultivate the soil. שָׁרֵי חַלְיִים, “leaders of the forces, captains.” בְּשָׂרָה, “in the country,” as opposed to the city; שָׂדָה, “fields,” as in xvii. 3. אֲנָשָׁהֶם, “their men,” the troops under the captains.

כִּי הָפֹקֵד אֲתָנוּ, “that he had committed to his oversight and care.” “Men,” viz. old, weak, infirm men; “women and children,” whose husbands and fathers had perished; “and some of the poor of the country, of those who had not been carried captive to Babylon” (וְ partitive), *i.e.* the poor and mean people whom the Chaldeans had left behind in the country (xxxix. 10).—Ver. 8 ff. These captains came to Mizpah, namely (ל explicative), Ishmael the son of Nethaniah (according to xli. 1, the grandson of Elishama, and of royal blood), Johanan and Jonathan the sons of Kareah (cf. ver. 13 and xli. 11, 16, xlii. 1 ff.); the name Jonathan is omitted in 2 Kings xxv. 23; see on this passage), Seraiah the son of Tanhumeth, and the sons of Ephai the Netophathite (from Netophah in the vicinity of Bethlehem, 1 Chron. ii. 54, Ezra ii. 22), Jezaniah (יְזָנִיָּה; but in 2 Kings xxv. 23 יְזָנִיָּה) the Maachathite, from Maachah, a district in Syria near Hermon, Deut. iii. 14, Josh. xii. 5. These men, who had borne arms against the Chaldeans, were concerned for their safety when they returned into the country. Gedaliah sware to them, *i.e.* promised them on oath, “Be not afraid to serve the Chaldeans; remain in the country and serve the king of Babylon, and it shall be well with you. And as for me, behold, I shall remain at Mizpah to stand before the Chaldeans who will come to us,” *i.e.* as lieutenant of the king of Babylon, to represent you before the Chaldean officers and armies, to maintain your rights and interests, so that you may be able to settle down where you choose, without anxiety, and cultivate the land. “And as for yourselves, gather ye wine and fruit (רַבָּה, see on 2 Sam. xvi. 1) and oil, and put them in your vessels.” שְׁבָתָן is used of the ingathering of the fruits of the ground. It was during the fifth or sixth month (2 Kings xxv. 8), the end of July or beginning of August, that grapes, figs, and olives became ripe; and these had grown so plentifully in comparison with the small number of those who had returned, that they could gather sufficient for their wants. “And dwell in your cities, cities which ye seize,” *i.e.* which you shall take possession of. Ver. 11 ff. Those Jews also who had fled, during the war, into the neighbouring countries of Moab, Ammon, Edom, etc., returned to Judah when they learned that the king of Babylon had left a remnant, and

placed Gedaliah over them ; they came to Mizpah to Gedaliah, who appointed them places to dwell in, and they gathered much wine and fruit, *i.e.* made a rich vintage and fruit harvest. **נָתַן שְׁאָרִית**, “to give a remainder,” as it were to leave a remainder (**שְׁאָרִית** **שׁ**, xliv. 7, or **שְׁוָם** **שׁ**, Gen. xlv. 7).

Vers. 13-16. *Gedaliah is forewarned of Ishmael's intention to murder him.*—After the return of those who had taken refuge in Moab, etc., Johanan the son of Kareah, together with the rest of the captains who were scattered here and there through the country, came to Gedaliah at Mizpah, to say to him : “Dost thou know indeed that Baalis the king of the Ammonites hath sent Ishmael the son of Nethaniah to take thy life ?” The words “that were in the country” are neither a gloss, nor a thoughtless repetition by some scribe from ver. 7 (as Hitzig and Graf suppose), but they are repeated for the purpose of distinguishing plainly between the captains with their men from the Jews who had returned out of Moab, Ammon, and Edom. **נָפַט**, **הַבּוֹת**, “to strike the soul, life” = to kill ; cf. Gen. xxxvii. 21, Deut. xix. 6. What induced the king of Ammon to think of assassination,—whether it was personal hostility towards Gedaliah, or the hope of destroying the only remaining support of the Jews, and thereby perhaps putting himself in possession of the country,—cannot be determined. That he employed Ishmael for the accomplishment of his purpose, may have been owing to the fact that this man had a personal envy of Gedaliah ; for Ishmael, being sprung from the royal family (xl. 1), probably could not endure being subordinate to Gedaliah.—The plot had become known, and Gedaliah was secretly informed of it by Johanan ; but the former did not believe the rumour. Johanan then secretly offered to slay Ishmael, taking care that no one should know who did it, and urged compliance in the following terms : “Why should he slay thee, and all the Jews who have gathered themselves round thee be scattered, and the remnant of Judah perish ?” Johanan thus called his attention to the evil consequences which would result to the remnant left in the land were he killed ; but Gedaliah replied, “Do not this thing, for thou speakest a lie against Ishmael.” The *Qeri* needlessly changes **שְׁעִיר־לְלָא** into **הַעִיר־לְאָא** ; cf. xxxix. 12.

Chap. xli. vers. 1-10. *Murder of Gedaliah and his followers, as well as other Jews, by Ishmael.*—Vers. 1-3. The warning of Johanan had been only too well founded. In the seventh month,—only two months, therefore, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the appointment of Gedaliah as governor,—Ishmael came with ten men to Mizpah, and was hospitably received by Gedaliah and invited to his table. Ishmael is here more exactly described as to his family descent, for the purpose of throwing a stronger light upon the exceeding cruelty of the murders afterwards ascribed to him. He was the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama,—perhaps the secretary of state mentioned xxxvi. 12, or more likely the son of David who bore this name, 2 Sam. v. 6, 1 Chron. iii. 8, xiv. 7; so that Ishmael would belong to a lateral branch of the house of David, be of royal extraction, and one of the royal lords. וּרְבֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ cannot be joined with Ishmael as the subject, because in what follows there is no further mention made of the royal lords, but only of Ishmael and his ten men; it belongs to what precedes, מִשְׁרָעַ בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ, so that we must repeat וּ before רְבֵי. The objections of Nägelsbach to this view will not stand examination. It is not self-evident that Ishmael, because he was of royal blood, was therefore also one of the royal nobles; for the רבִים certainly did not form a hereditary caste, but were perhaps a class of nobles in the service of the king, to which class the princes did not belong simply in virtue of their being princes. But the improbability that Ishmael should have been able with ten men to overpower the whole of the Jewish followers of Gedaliah, together with the Chaldean warriors, and (according to ver. 7) out of eighty men to kill some, making prisoners of the rest, is not so great as to compel us to take רבִים in such a meaning as to make it stand in contradiction with the statement, repeated twice over, that Ishmael, with his ten men, did all this. Eleven men who are determined to commit murder can kill a large number of persons who are not prepared against such an attempt, and may also keep a whole district in terror.¹ “And they did eat bread there together,” i.e. they were invited by Gedaliah to

¹ There is still less ground, with Hitzig, Graf, and Nägelsbach, for assuming that וּרְבֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ is a gloss that has crept into the text. The fact that רבִים, which is used here, is elsewhere applied only to Chaldean nobles,

his table. While at meat, Ishmael and his ten men rose and slew Gedaliah with the sword. On account of יִמְתַּח אֹתֹהּ, which comes after, Hitzig and Graf would change יִמְתַּח into יִכְבֹּשׁ, *he slew him*, Gedaliah; this alteration is possibly warranted, but by no means absolutely necessary. The words יִמְתַּח אֹתֹהּ וְנָוֹ, “and he killed him,” contain a reflection of the narrator as to the greatness of the crime; in conformity with the facts of the case, the murder is ascribed only to the originator of the deed, since the ten men of Ishmael’s retinue were simply his executioners. Besides Gedaliah, Ishmael killed “all the Jews that were with him, with Gedaliah in Mizpah, and the Chaldeans that were found there, the men of war.” The very expression shows that, of the Jews, only those are meant who were present in the house with Gedaliah, and, of the Chaldean soldiers, only those warriors who had been allowed him as a guard, who for the time being were his servants, and who, though they were not, as Schmidt thinks, *hausto liberalius vino inebriati*, yet, as Chr. B. Michaelis remarks, were *tunc temporis inermes et imparati*. The Jews of post-exile times used to keep the third day of the seventh month as a fast-day, in commemoration of the murder of Gedaliah; see on Zech. vii. 3.—Ver. 4 ff. On the next day after the murder of Gedaliah, “when no man knew it,” *i.e.* before the deed had become known beyond Mizpah, “there came eighty men from Shechem, Shiloh, and Samaria,” having all the tokens of mourning, “with their beards shaven, their clothes rent, and with cuts and scratches on their bodies (מִתְפְּרִידִים, see on xvi. 6), and a meat-offering and frankincense in their hand, to bring them into the house of Jahveh.” The order in which the towns are named is not geographical; for Shiloh lay south from Shechem, and a little to the side from the straight road leading from Shechem to Jerusalem. Instead of סָלִים, the LXX. (*Cod. Vat.*) have Σαλήμ; they use the same word as the name of a place in Gen. xxxiii. 18, although the Hebrew סָלִים is there an adjective, meaning *safe*, in *good condition*. According to Robinson (*Bibl. Res.* iii. 102), there is a village named *Sâlim*

is insufficient to show this; and even Ewald has remarked that “the last king (Zedekiah) may well be supposed to have appointed a number of *grandees*, after the example of the Chaldeans, and given them, too, Chaldean names.”

three miles east from *Nablus* (Shechem); Hitzig and Graf, on the strength of this, prefer the reading of the LXX., to preserve the order of the names in the text. But Hitzig has renounced this conjecture in the second edition of his Commentary, "because Sâlim in Hebrew would be שָׁלִם, not שְׁלִם." There is absolutely no foundation for the view in the LXX. and in Gen. xxxiii. 18; the supposition, moreover, that the three towns are given in their topographical order, and must have stood near each other, is also unfounded. Shechem may have been named first because the greater number of these men came from that city, and other men from Shiloh and Samaria accompanied them. These men were pious descendants of the Israelites who belonged to the kingdom of Israel; they dwelt among the heathen colonists who had been settled in the country under Esarhaddon (2 Kings xvii. 24 ff.), but, from the days of Hezekiah or Josiah, had continued to serve Jahveh in Jerusalem, where they used to attend the feasts (2 Chron. xxxiv. 9, cf. xxx. 11). Nay, even after the destruction of Jerusalem, at the seasons of the sacred feasts, they were still content to bring at least unbloody offerings—meat-offerings and incense—on the still sacred spot where these things used to be offered to Jahveh; but just because this could now be done only on the ruins of what had once been the sanctuary, they appeared there with all the signs of deep sorrow for the destruction of this holy place and the cessation of sacrificial worship. In illustration of this, Grotius has adduced a passage from Papinian's *instit. de rerum divis. § sacrae*: "*Locus in quo aedes sacrae sunt aedificatae, etiam diruto aedificio, sacer adhuc manet.*"—Ver. 6. Ishmael went out from Mizpah to meet these men, always weeping as he went (הַלְךְ וּבָכֵה, cf. Ges. § 131, *a^b*; Ew. § 280, *b*). If they came from Ephraim by way of Gibeon (el Jîb), the road on to Jerusalem passed close by Mizpah. When Ishmael met them, he asked them to come to Gedaliah (to Mizpah). But when they had entered the city, "Ishmael slew them into the midst of the pit" (which was there), *i.e.* killed them and cast their corpses into the pit. Ver. 8. Only ten men out of the eighty saved their lives, and this by saying to Ishmael, "Do not kill us, for we have hidden stores in the field—wheat, and barley, and oil, and honey." מִתְמִנִּים are excavations in the form of

cisterns, or subterranean storehouses in the open country, for keeping grain; the openings or entrances to these are so concealed that the eye of a stranger could not perceive them. Such places are still universally employed in Palestine at the present day (Robinson's *Palestine*, i. pp. 324-5), and are also to be found in other southern countries, both in ancient and modern times; see proofs of this in Rosenmüller's *Scholia ad hunc locum*. It is remarked, in ver. 9, of the pit into which Ishmael threw the corpses, that it was the same that King Asa had made, *i.e.* had caused to be made, against, *i.e.* for protection against, Baasha the king of Israel. In the historical books there is no mention made of this pit in the account of the war between Asa and Baasha, 1 Kings xv. 16-22 and 2 Chron. xvi. 1-6; it is only stated in 1 Kings xv. 22 and 2 Chron. xvi. 6 that, after Baasha, who had fortified Ramah, had been compelled to return to his own land because of the invasion of Benhadad the Syrian king, whom Asa had called to his aid, the king of Judah ordered all his people to carry away from Ramah the stones and timber which Baasha had employed in building, and therewith fortify Geba and Mizpah. The expression מִפְנֵי בָּעֵשָׂא certainly implies that the pit had been formed as a protection against Baasha, and belonged to the fortifications raised at that time. However, הַפּוֹרֶן cannot mean the burial-place belonging to the city (Grotius), but only a cistern (cf. 2 Kings x. 14); and one such as could contain a considerable store of water was as necessary as a wall and a moat for the fortification of a city, so that it might be able to endure a long siege (Graf). Hitzig, on the other hand, takes בָּזָר to mean a long and broad ditch which cut off the approach to the city from Ephraim, or which, forming a part of the fortifications, made a break in the road to Jerusalem, though it was bridged over in times of peace, thus forming a kind of tunnel. This idea is certainly incorrect; for, according to ver. 7, the "ditch" was inside the city (ברֹחֶק הַעִיר). The expression בַּיָּד גְּדָלִיָּה is obscure, and cannot be explained with any degree of certainty. בַּיָּד cannot mean "through the fault of" Gedaliah (Raschi), or "because of" Gedaliah—for his sake (Kimchi, Umbreit), or "coram" Gedaliah (Venema), but must rather be rendered "by means of, through the medium of," or "at the side of, together with." Nägelsbach has decided

for the rendering “by means of,” giving as his reason the fact that Ishmael had made use of the name of Gedaliah in order to decoy these men into destruction. He had called to them, “Come to Gedaliah” (ver. 6); and simply on the authority of this name, they had followed him. But the employment of the name as a means of decoy can hardly be expressed by בַּיִד. We therefore prefer the meaning “at the hand = at the side of” (following the Syriac, L. de Dieu, Rosenmüller, Ewald), although this signification cannot be established from the passages cited by Rosenm. (1 Sam. xiv. 34, xvi. 2, Ezra vii. 23), nor can the meaning “together with” (Ewald) be shown to belong to it. On the other hand, a passage which is quite decisive for the rendering “by the hand of, beside,” is Job xv. 23: “there stands ready at his hand (בַּיִד, i.e. close to him) a day of darkness.” If we take this meaning for the passage now before us, then אֲשֶׁר הַפְּה cannot be connected with בַּיִד גְּדַלְיָה, in accordance with the Masoretic accents, but with הַשְׁלֵך שָׁם, “where Ishmael cast the bodies of the men whom he had slain, by the side of Gedaliah;” so that it is not stated till here and now, and only in a casual manner, what had become of Gedaliah’s corpse. Nothing that admits of being proved can be brought against this view.¹ The הַא which follows is a predicate: “the ditch wherein was that which Asa the king had formed.”

The motive for this second series of assassinations by Ishmael is difficult to discover. The supposition that he was afraid of

¹ Because the LXX. have, for בַּיִד גְּדַלְיָה הַוָּא, φρέαρ μέγα τοῦτο ἐστιν, J. D. Michaelis, Dahler, Movers, Hitzig, and Graf would change the text, and either take בַּיִד גְּדַלְיָה הַוָּא (= בַּיִד הַפְּדוֹל הַוָּא) or בַּזָּר (בַּזָּר פְּדוֹל) as the original reading, inasmuch as one codex of De Rossi’s also has בַּזָּר. But apart from the improbability of בַּזָּר פְּדוֹל or בַּזָּר הַפְּדוֹל being incorrectly changed into בַּיִד גְּדַלְיָה, we find that הַא stands provokingly in the way; for it would be superfluous, or introduce an improper emphasis into the sentence. The LXX. have but been attempting to guess at a translation of a text they did not understand. What Hitzig further supposes has no foundation, viz. that this “ditch” is identical with that mentioned 1 Sam. xix. 22, in שְׁבִי, and with τὸ φρέαρ τὸ μέγα of 1 Macc. vii. 19; for the ditch at Sechu was near Ramah, which was about four miles from Mizpah, and the large fountain 1 Macc. vii. 19 was ἡ Βηζεθ, an unknown place in the vicinity of Jerusalem.

being betrayed, and for this reason killed these strangers, not wishing to be troubled with them, is improbable, for the simple reason that these strangers did not want to go to Mizpah, but to Jerusalem. For the supposition of Thenius (on 2 Kings xxv. 23) and of Schmieder, that the people had intended going to Mizpah to a house of God that was there, is very properly rejected by Hitzig, because no mention is made in history of a place of worship at Mizpah; and, according to the express statement of ver. 6 ff., Ishmael had enticed them into this city only by inviting them to come and see Gedaliah. Had Ishmael wished merely to conceal the murder of Gedaliah from these strangers, he ought to have done anything but let them into Mizpah. As little can we regard this deed (with Graf) as an act of revenge on these Israelites by Ishmael for the murder of his relations and equals in rank by Nebuchadnezzar (lii. 10), because these men, who had now for a long time been living together with heathens, were Assyrian and Chaldean subjects. For we cannot comprehend how he could look on these Israelites as friends of the Chaldeans, and vent his anger against the Chaldean rule by murdering them; the mournful procession which they formed, and the offerings they were carrying to present, proclaimed them faithful adherents of Judah. Nägelsbach, accordingly, is of opinion that Ishmael had simply intended robbery. As it is evident that he, a rough and wild man, had assassinated the noble Gedaliah from personal jealousy, and in order to further the political interest of his Ammonite patron, he must have been seeking to put himself in the position of his victim, or to flee. "When we find, moreover, that he soon murdered a peaceable caravan of pilgrims, and preserved the lives only of a few who offered to show him hidden treasures; when, finally, we perceive that the whole *turba imbellis* of Mizpah were seized and carried off into slavery, Ishmael proves himself a mere robber." But, though the fact that Ishmael spared the lives of the ten men who offered to show him hidden treasures seems to support this view, yet the supposition that nothing more than robbery was intended does not suffice to explain the double murder. The two series of assassinations plainly stand in the closest connection, and must have been executed from one and the same motive. It was at the instiga-

tion of the Ammonite king that Ishmael murdered Gedaliah ; moreover, as we learn from the report brought to Gedaliah by Johanan (xl. 15), the crime was committed in the expectation that the whole of Judah would then be dispersed, and the remnant of them perish. This murder was thus the work of the Ammonite king, who selected the royally-descended Ishmael as his instrument simply because he could conveniently, for the execution of his plans, employ the personal envy of one man against another who had been preferred by the king of Babylon. There can be no doubt that the same motive which urged him to destroy the remnant of Judah, *i.e.* to frustrate the attempt to gather and restore Judah, was also at work in the massacre of the pilgrims who were coming to the temple. If Ishmael, the leader of a robber-gang, had entered into the design of the Ammonite king, then everything that might serve for the preservation and consolidation of Judah must have been a source of pain to him ; and this hatred of his towards Judah, which derived its strength and support from his religious views, incited him to murder the Jewish pilgrims to the temple, although the prospect of obtaining treasures might well co-operate with this in such a way as to make him spare the ten men who pretended they had hidden stores. With this, too, we can easily connect the hypocritical dealing on the part of Ishmael, in going forth, with tears, to meet these pious pilgrims, so that he might deceive them by making such a show of grief over the calamity that had befallen Judah ; for the wicked often assume an appearance of sanctity for the more effectual accomplishment of their evil deeds. The LXX. evidently did not know what to make of this passage as it stands ; hence, in ver. 6, they have quite dropped the words "from Mizpah," and have rendered *בְּכָה קָלְקָלָה* by *αὐτοὶ ἐπορεύοντο καὶ ἔκλαιον.* Hitzig and Graf accept this as indicating the original text, since Ishmael had no ostensible ground for weeping. But the reasons which are supposed to justify this conjecture are, as Nägelsbach well remarks, of such a nature that one can scarcely believe they are seriously held.—Ver. 10. After executing these murderous deeds, Ishmael led away into captivity all the people that still remained in Mizpah, the king's daughters and all the people whom Nebuchadnezzar had committed to the care of

Gedaliah, intending to go over with them to the Ammonites. As the object of שָׁבֵן is very far removed through the intervention of a relative clause, the connection is resumed by שָׁבֵן. "The king's daughters" are not only the daughters of Zedekiah, but female members generally of the royal house, princesses, analogous to בָּנָה, king's son = prince, xxxvi. 26, xxxviii. 6.

Vers. 11.-18. *The struggle against Ishmael; intended flight to Egypt.*—Ver. 11 ff. When Johanan and the rest of the captains heard of what had taken place in Mizpah, they marched out with all their men to fight Ishmael, and came on him at the great water at Gibeon, *i.e.* by the pool at Gibeon which is mentioned 2 Sam. ii. 13, one of the large receptacles for water which are still found there; see on 2 Sam. ii. 13. Gibeon, now called *el Jib* (see on Josh. ix. 3), was situated only about two miles north from Mizpah; from which we may conclude that it was soon known what had happened, and the captains quickly assembled their men and marched after Ishmael.—Ver. 13 ff. When those who had been carried off by Ishmael saw these captains, they were glad, since they had followed their captor merely because they were forced to do so. They all turned, and went over to Johanan; but Ishmael escaped from Johanan, with eight men,—having thus lost two in the fight with Johanan,—and went to the Ammonites.—Ver. 16 ff. After the escape of Ishmael, it was to be feared that the Chaldeans would avenge the murder of the governor, and make the Jews who remained atone for the escape of the murderer by executing them or carrying them away to Babylon. Accordingly, Johanan and the other captains determined to withdraw to Egypt with the men, women, and children that had been carried off by Ishmael; these they conducted first to Bethlehem, where they encamped for the purpose of deliberating as to the rest of the journey, and taking due precautions. The account given in ver. 16 is clumsily expressed, especially the middle portion, between "whom he had brought back" and "the son of Ahikam;" and in this part the words "from Mizpah" are particularly troublesome in breaking the connection: "whom he (Johanan) had brought back from Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, from Mizpah, after he (Ishmael) had slain Gedaliah," while it is more correctly stated in the second

relative clause, “whom he had brought back from Gibeon.” Hitzig and Graf accordingly suppose that, originally, instead of אֲשֶׁר הַשִּׁבֵּב מִאֵת, there stood in the text אֲשֶׁר שָׁבָה, “whom he (Ishmael) had led captive from Mizpah, after he had slain Gedaliah.” Thus the whole becomes clear. Against this conjecture there only stands the fact that the LXX. translate οὐς ἀπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ Ἰσμαήλ; they must thus have read אֲשֶׁר הַשִּׁבֵּב מִאֵת, and omitted merely הַפְּצִiph as unsuited to the passage. However, the error may be even older than the LXX., and הַשִּׁבֵּב מִאֵת may easily have arisen through a scribe having glanced at the words אֲשֶׁר הַשִּׁבֵּב of the last clause. The words from “men” to “chamberlains” form the more exact specification of the general expression “all the remnant of the people:” “men, viz. men of war, women (including the king’s daughters, ver. 10), and children and chamberlains” (סִרִיסִים, guardians and servants of the female members of the royal family).—Ver. 17. “They marched and stopped (made a halt) at the inn of Chimham, which is near Bethlehem.” בְּרוּת, ἄπ. λεγ., considered etymologically, must mean *divisorium*, *hospitium*, an inn, khan, or caravanserai. Instead of the *Kethib* בְּמוֹהָם, many codices read בְּמִזְמָם (like the *Qeri*); nor have any of the old translators read בְּ or בְּ in the word. The *Qeri* is evidently correct, and we are to read בְּמִזְמָם, the name of a son of Barzillai the rich Gileadite, 2 Sam. xix. 38, 41, who is supposed to have built or founded this caravanserai for the convenience of travellers. The words “because of the Chaldeans” in the beginning of ver. 18 depend on “to go to Egypt” at the end of the preceding verse: “to go to Egypt for fear of the Chaldeans,” on account of the murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael.

Chap. xlii. *The Word of God concerning the Flight to Egypt.*

At the halting-place near Bethlehem the captains and the people whom they led deem it necessary to inquire through Jeremiah as to the will of God regarding their intention; they betake themselves to the prophet with the request that he would address God in prayer for them regarding this matter, and they promise that they will, in any case, comply with the message that he may receive from God (vers. 1–6). Whereupon, after ten days, the word of the Lord came to the prophet, vers. 7–22,

to the effect that, if they remained in the country, the Lord would take pity on them and protect them from the Chaldeans, and establish them; but, should they go to Egypt, against the will of the Lord, then the evil which they feared would follow them thither, so that they would perish by the sword, hunger, and pestilence.

Vers. 1-6. “And there drew near all the captains, namely, Johanan the son of Kareah, and Jezaniah the son of Hoshiah, and all the people, from little to great, Ver. 2. And said to Jeremiah the prophet, Let our supplication come before thee, and pray for us to Jahveh thy God, for all this remnant (for we are left a few out of many, as thine eyes see us); Ver. 3. That Jahveh thy God may tell us the way in which we should go, and the thing that we should do.” Of the captains, two, viz. Johanan and Jezaniah, are mentioned as the leaders of the people and the directors of the whole undertaking, who also, xlivi. 1 ff., insolently accuse the prophet of falsehood, and carry out the proposed march to Egypt. Jezaniah is in xl. 8 called the Maachathite; here he is named in connection with his father, “the son of Hoshiah;” while in xlivi. 2, in conjunction with Johanan the son of Kareah, Azariah the son of Hoshiah is mentioned, which name the LXX. also have in ver. 1 of this chapter. Hitzig, Ewald, etc., are consequently of the opinion that יְנִינִה in our verse has been written by mistake for עֲרִינִה. But more probable is the supposition that the error is in the שְׁוִירָה of xlivi. 2, inasmuch as there is no reason to doubt the identity of Jezaniah the son of Hoshiah with the Jezaniah descended from Maacha (xl. 8); and the assumption that יְנִינִה is incorrect in two passages (xlivi. 1 and xl. 8) is highly improbable. They go to the prophet Jeremiah, whom they had taken with them from Mizpah, where he was living among the people, with the rest of the inhabitants of the place (xli. 16). תְּפִלְנָא תְּחַ ‘as in xxxvii. 20; see on xxxvi. 7. The request made to the prophet that he would intercede for them with the Lord, which they further urge on the ground that the number left out of the whole people is small, while there is implied in this the wish that God may not let this small remnant also perish;—this request Nägelsbach considers a piece of hypocrisy, and the form of asking the prophet “a mere farce,”

since it is quite plain from xliii. 1-6 that the desire to go to Egypt was already deeply rooted in their minds, and from this they would not allow themselves to be moved, even by the earnest warning of the prophet. But to hypocrites, who were playing a mere farce with the prophet, the Lord would have probably replied in a different way from what we find in vers. 8-22. As the Searcher of hearts, He certainly would have laid bare their hypocrisy. And however unequivocally the whole address implies the existence of disobedience to the voice of God, it yet contains nothing which can justify the assumption that it was only in hypocrisy that they wished to learn the will of God. We must therefore assume that their request addressed to the prophet was made in earnest, although they expected that the Lord's reply would be given in terms favourable to their intention. They wished to obtain from God information as to which way they should go, and what they should do,—not as to whether they should remain in the country or go to Egypt. “The way that we should go” is, of course, not to be understood literally, as if they merely wished to be told the road by which they would most safely reach Egypt; neither, on the other hand, are the words to be understood in a merely figurative sense, of the mode of procedure they ought to pursue; but they are to be understood of the road they ought to take in order to avoid the vengeance of the Chaldeans which they dreaded,—in the sense, whither they ought to go, in order to preserve their lives from the danger which threatened them.—Ver. 4. Jeremiah replies: “I have heard (*i.e.* acceded to your request); behold, I will pray to Jahveh your God, according to your words; and it shall come to pass that whatever Jahveh answers you I will tell you, I will not keep anything from you.” Ver. 5. They said further: “Let Jahveh be a true and faithful witness against us, if we do not just according to all the word which Jahveh thy God shall send thee (to declare) unto us. Ver. 6. Whether it be good or bad, we shall obey the voice of Jahveh our God, to whom we send thee, that it may be well with us when we obey the voice of Jahveh our God.” **מְמַתֵּן יְהָוָה**, Prov. xiv. 25, and **מְמַתֵּן**, Isa. viii. 2, Ps. lxxxix. 38. Both predicates occupy emphatic positions. God is to be a faithful witness, not in regard to the

truth of what they say, but as regards the fulfilment of their promise, so that, if they would not obey His word, He might come forward to punish them. **שָׁלַח־לְ** is construed with a double accusative: to send away a person with something, *i.e.* to give him a commission. After “whether it be good or evil,” there is no need for supplying “in our eyes” (**בְּעֵינֵינוּ**), as Hitzig and Graf allege: “whether it please us or not;” the subject is **תְּהִלֵּבָר**: “we will obey the word, whether it be good or evil,” *i.e.* whether it announce good or evil to come (cf. Eccles. xii. 14). The *Kethib* **נָאַנְ** occurs only in this passage in the Old Testament; the *Qeri* accordingly substitutes **נָאַנְנָ**: the former, however, is taken from the vulgar tongue, and should not be altered here. **פִּי נְשָׁמָעַ** does not mean “*because* we obey,” but “when we obey.” The hearing is the condition, not the cause of the prosperity.

Vers. 7-22. *The word of the Lord.*—At the end of ten days, the reply that had been asked for came from the Lord. Hitzig and Graf think that Jeremiah had lingered ten days with the answer, in order to obtain strong and clear conviction, “matured through his own meditation, probably also in part confirmed by the arrival of further news.” This opinion is characterized by Nägelsbach as “in harmony with modern science, but unhistorical;” it should rather be called unscriptural, as resting on a denial of divine inspiration. The reason why the Lord did not make known His will to the prophet for ten days was a disciplinary one. By waiting, those who asked would get time for bethinking themselves, and for quietly considering the situation of affairs, so that they might be able, calmly and collectedly, to receive and obey the answer of God, which was far from satisfying the fears and wishes of their heart. Ver. 8. Jeremiah called the captains and all the people together, and announced to them as follows: Ver. 9. “Thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, to whom ye have sent me, that I might bring your supplication before Him: Ver. 10. If ye will indeed abide in this land, then will I build you up and not pull down; and I will plant you, but not root out; for I repent of the evil that I have done to you. Ver. 11. Be not afraid of the king of Babylon, whom ye fear, be not afraid of him, saith Jahveh; for I am with you to save you and to deliver you out

of his hand. Ver. 12. And I will get pity for you, so that he shall take pity on you, and bring you back to your land. Ver. 13. But if ye say, We will not remain in this land, so that ye will not obey the voice of Jahveh your God, Ver. 14. Saying, Nay, but we will go to the land of Egypt, that we may not see war nor hear the sound of a trumpet, and we shall not hunger after bread, and we will dwell there.—Ver. 15. Now therefore hear the word of Jahveh, ye remnant of Judah : Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel, If ye do indeed set your face to go to Egypt, and go to sojourn there, Ver. 16. Then shall the sword, of which ye are afraid, overtake you there, in the land of Egypt, and hunger, which ye dread, shall there follow hard after you, in Egypt, and there shall ye die. Ver. 17. And all the men who have set their face to go to Egypt, to sojourn there, shall die by the sword, and through hunger, and from the plague; nor shall they have any one left or escaped from the evil which I will bring on them. Ver. 18. For thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel : As mine anger and my wrath were poured out upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so shall my wrath be poured out upon you when ye go to Egypt, and ye shall become an execration, and an astonishment, and a curse, and a reproach, and ye shall not see this place again.—Ver. 19. Jahveh hath spoken to you, O remnant of Judah. Go not to Egypt: ye shall know for certain that I have warned you to-day. Ver. 20. For ye err at the risk of your souls when ye sent me to Jahveh your God, saying, Pray for us to Jahveh our God, and according to all that Jahveh our God shall say to us, so tell us, and we will do it. Ver. 21. Now I have told you to-day, and ye have not obeyed the voice of Jahveh your God, nor in anything for which He hath sent me unto you. Ver. 22. Now, therefore, ye must surely know that ye shall die by the sword, by famine, and by pestilence in the place whither ye have been pleased to go to sojourn."

The Lord's reply extends as far as ver. 18; the last four verses (19-22) form an epilogue, a further address by the prophet, in which he once more specially impresses God's resolution on the minds of the people. The answer of God consists (1) in the promise that, if they will remain in the land, the Lord is willing to build them up, and protect them from

the wrath of the king of Babylon (vers. 9-12); and (2) the threat that, if they will go to Egypt against the advice and will of the Lord, they shall certainly perish there by the sword, famine, and pestilence (vers. 13-18). On the expression הַפְּלִיל תְּחִפָּה, see on xxxvi. 7. שׁׂוב (ver. 10) can only be inf. abs. of שׁׂבָּע, for יִשְׁבָּע; if we view it as coming from שׁׂבָּע, we get no suitable meaning, for the thought *si revertendo illuc manseritis in hác terrá* (C. B. Michaelis) could not be expressed by שׁׂוב תְּשַׁבְּבִי. Certainly there is no other instance of such a form as שׁׂוב being used for יִשְׁבָּע; in a verb like שׁׂבָּע, however, which drops the ' in the inf. constr., a like omission in the inf. abs. is quite conceivable, while the supposition of some injury having been done to the text (Olshausen, *Gram.* § 89) is less probable. On the expression, "I will build you," etc., cf. xxiv. 6, xxxi. 4, xxxiii. 7. "I repent of the evil" is an anthropopathic expression for the cancelling of a penal sentence: cf. Joel ii. 14, etc.—In ver. 11, the repetition of the words "do not fear him" produces special emphasis.—Ver. 12. "I shall give you compassion," i.e. obtain it for you, so that the king of Babylon will show pity on you; cf. Gen. xlivi. 14, 1 Kings viii. 50. J. D. Michaelis, Hitzig, Ewald, and Graf, following the LXX., Vulgate, and Syriac, would change הַשְׁׂיב וְהַשְׁׂיב into (make you dwell); but there is no necessity for this, since הַשְׁׂיב makes good enough sense, provided we refer it, not to the return of those who had been exiled to Babylon, but, as the connection requires, to the departure from Mizpah, after the halt near Bethlehem, in the intended flight to Egypt; we must, besides, view this departure as a complete forsaking of their country, and the leaders in this emigration as being fugitives who had fled before the Chaldeans, and had returned only a short time before, for the purpose of settling down again in the country.—Vers. 13-18. The threatening if, in spite of warning and against God's will, they should still persist in going to Egypt. The protasis of the conditional sentence begun in ver. 13, "If ye say," etc., extends onwards through ver. 14; the apodosis is introduced co-ordinately with the commencement of ver. 15, "Now therefore," etc. קֹל שׁׂופֶר, "the sound of war-trumpet," as in iv. 19. On "hungering after bread," cf. Amos viii. 11. הַלְּחֵם (with

the article) is the bread necessary for life. “The remnant of Judah” is to be understood of those who still remained in the land, as is shown by ver. 2; see also ver. 19, xlivi. 5, xliv. 12, 14. The warning given in ver. 16 contains the idea that the very evil which they feared would come on them in Judah will befall them in Egypt. There they shall perish by sword, famine, and plague, since Nebuchadnezzar will conquer Egypt; cf. xlivi. 8-13.—Ver. 17. יְהִי, used instead of the impersonal הִנֵּה, is referred to the following subject by a rather unusual kind of attraction; cf. Ewald, § 345, b. All the men who set their faces, *i.e.* intend, to go to Egypt shall perish; not a single one shall escape the evil; for the same judgment of wrath which has befallen Jerusalem shall also come on those who flee to Egypt; cf. vii. 20. On the expression “ye shall become a curse,” etc., cf. xxiv. 9, xxv. 18, xxix. 18.

Taking for granted that the leaders of the people will not obey, Jeremiah appends to the word of the Lord an earnest address, in which several points are specially insisted on, viz. that the Lord had spoken to them, that He had forbidden them to go to Egypt, and that he (the prophet), by proclaiming the word of the Lord, had warned them (בְּעֵיד, to testify, bear witness against a person, *i.e.* warn him of something, cf. xi. 7). Thus he discloses to them the dangerous mistake they are in, when they first desire some expression of the mind of the Lord regarding their intentions, and, in the hope that He will accede to their request, promise unconditional obedience to whatever He may direct, but afterwards, when they have received a message from the Lord, will not obey it, because it is contrary to what they wish. The *Kethib* התעה has been incorrectly written for התעהם, the Hiphil from טעה, to err; here, as in Prov. x. 17, it means to make a mistake. בְּנֶפֶשׁ־תְּבוּכֶם, not, “you mislead your own selves,” *decepistis animas vestras* (Vulg.), nor “in your souls,”—meaning, in your thoughts and intentions (Nägelsbach),—but “at the risk of your souls,” your life; cf. xvii. 21. וְלֹכֶל אֲשֶׁר (ver. 21), “and that in regard to all that for which Jahveh has sent me to you,” points back to their promise, ver. 5, that they would do “according to all the word.” By employing the perfect in vers. 20, 21, the thing is represented as quite certain, as if it had already taken place. Ver. 22 concludes

the warning with a renewed threat of the destruction which shall befall them for their disobedience.

Chap. xlvi. *The Flight to Egypt: the Conquest of Egypt predicted.*

Vers. 1-7. *The march of the people to Egypt.*—When Jeremiah had thus ended all the words which the Lord had announced to him for the people, then came forward Azariah (probably an error for Jezaniah, see on xlvi. 1) the son of Hoshaiah, Johanan the son of Kareah, and the rest of the insolent men, and said to Jeremiah, “Thou dost utter falsehood; Jahveh our God hath not sent thee unto us, saying, Ye must not go to Egypt to sojourn there; Ver. 3. But Baruch the son of Neriah inciteth thee against us, in order to give us into the hand of the Chaldeans, to kill us, and to take us captive to Babylon.” אָמַרְתָּם is not the predicate to בְּלִתְהָאָנָשִׁים, but forms a resumption of וַיֹּאמֶר, with which it thus serves to connect its object, Jeremiah, and from which it would otherwise be pretty far removed. Azariah (or, more correctly, Jezaniah) occupies the last place in the enumeration of the captains, xl. 8, and in xlvi. 1 is also named after Johanan, who is the only one specially mentioned, in what follows, as the leader on the march. From this we may safely conclude that Jezaniah was the chief speaker and the leader of the opposition against the prophet. To avoid any reference to the promise they had made to obey the will of God, they declare that Jeremiah’s prophecy is an untruth, which had been suggested to him, not by God, but by his attendant Baruch, with the view of delivering up the people to the Chaldeans.—Vers. 4-7. Therenupon Johanan and the other captains took “all the remnant of Judah, that had returned from all the nations whither they had been driven, to dwell in the land of Judah,—the men and women and children, the king’s daughters, and all the souls whom Nebuzaradan, chief of the body-guard, had committed to Gedaliah . . . and Jeremiah the prophet, and Baruch the son of Neriah,—and went to the land of Egypt—for they did not hearken to the voice of Jahveh—and came to Tahpanhes.” In this enumeration of those who were conducted to Egypt, Hitzig, Graf, and others distinguish two classes:

(1) the men, women, children, etc., who had been in Mizpah with Gedaliah, and had been led to Gibeon, after the murder of the latter, by Ishmael, but had afterwards been brought to Bethlehem by Johanan and the other captains (ver. 6, cf. xl. 7, xli. 10, 16); (2) those who had returned from the foreign countries whither they had fled, but who had hitherto lived in the country, scattered here and there, and who must have joined the company led by Johanan to Bethlehem during the ten days of halt at that resting-place (ver. 5, cf. xl. 11, 12). There is no foundation, however, for this distinction. Neither in the present chapter is there anything mentioned of those who had been dispersed through the land joining those who had marched to Bethlehem; nor are the Jews who had returned from Moab, Ammon, Edom, and other countries to their own home distinguished, in chap. xl. and xli., as a different class from those who had been with Gedaliah in Mizpah; but on the other hand, according to xl. 12, these returned Jews also came to Gedaliah at Mizpah, and gathered grapes and fruit. Besides, in these verses the distinction can only be made after the insertion into the text of the conjunction **וְ** before **אֶת-הַדְּבָרִים**. To "all the remnant of Judah who had returned from the nations" belong the men, women, children, etc., whom Nebuzaradan had committed to the care of Gedaliah. The enumeration in ver. 6 gives only one specification of the "whole remnant of Judah," as in xli. 16. "And all the souls;" as if it were said, "and whoever else was still left alive;" cf. Josh. x. 28. Tahpanhes was a frontier town of Egypt on the Pelusian branch of the Nile, and named *Δάφναι* by the Greeks; see on ii. 16. Here, on the borders of Egypt, a halt was made, for the purpose of coming to further resolutions regarding their residence in that country. Here, too, Jeremiah received a revelation from God regarding the fate now impending on Egypt.

Vers. 8-13. *Prediction regarding Egypt.*—Ver. 8. "And the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah in Tahpanhes, saying, Ver. 9. Take in thine hand large stones, and hide them in the clay in the brick-kiln, which is at the entrance to the house of Pharaoh in Taphanhes, in the eyes of the Jews; Ver. 10. And say to them: Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel,

Behold, I will send and take Nebuchadrezzar, the king of Babylon, my servant, and will place his throne over these stones which I have hidden, and he shall stretch his tapestry over them. Ver. 11. And he shall come and smite the land of Egypt, (he who is) for death, to death,—(he who is) for captivity, to captivity,—(he who is) for the sword, to the sword. Ver. 12. And I will kindle fire in the houses of the gods of Egypt, and he shall burn them and carry them away ; and he shall wrap the land of Egypt round him as the shepherd wraps his cloak round him, and thence depart in peace. Ver. 13. And he shall destroy the pillars of Beth-shemesh, which is in the land of Egypt, and the houses of the gods of the Egyptians shall he burn with fire."

This prophecy is introduced by a symbolical action, on which it is based. But in spite of the fact that the object of the action is stated in the address which follows, the action itself is not quite plain from the occurrence of **תְּלִיאָה**, whose usual meaning, "brick-kiln" (cf. Nah. iii. 14), does not seem suitable here. Eichhorn and Hitzig think it absurd that there should be found before the door of a royal habitation a brick-kiln on which a king was to place his throne. From the Arabic **مَلِين**, which also signifies a rectangular figure like a tile or brick, and is used of the projecting entablature of doors,—from the employment, also, in the Talmud of the word **תְּלִיאָה** to signify a quadrangular tablet in the form of a tile,—Hitzig would claim for the word the meaning of a *stone floor*, and accordingly renders, "and insert them with mortar into the stone flooring." But the entablatures over doors, or quadrangular figures like bricks, are nothing like a stone flooring or pavement before a palace. Besides, in the way of attaching to the word the signification of a "brick-kiln,"—a meaning which is well established,—or even of a brickwork, the difficulties are not so great as to compel us to accept interpretations that have no foundation. We do not need to think of a brick-kiln or brickwork as being always before the palace ; as Neumann has observed, it may have indeed been there, although only for a short time, during the erecting of some part of the palace ; nor need it have been just at the palace gateway, but a considerable distance away from it, and

on the opposite side. Alongside of it there was lying mortar, an indispensable building material. טמן, “to hide,” perhaps means here not merely to embed, but to embed in such a way that the stones could not very readily be perceived. Jeremiah was to press down the big stones, not into the brick-kiln, but into the mortar which was lying at (near) the brick-kiln,—to put them, too, before the eyes of the Jews, inasmuch as the meaning of this act had a primary reference to the fate of the Jews in Egypt. The object of the action is thus stated in what follows: Jahveh shall bring the king of Babylon and set his throne on these stones, so that he shall spread out his beautiful tapestry over them. שְׁפָרִיר (*Qeri* שְׁפָרִיר), an intensive form of שְׁפָרָה, “splendour, beauty,” signifies a glittering ornament,—here, the decoration of the throne, the gorgeous tapestry with which the seat of the throne was covered. The stones must thus form the basis for the throne, which the king of Babylon will set up in front of the palace of the king of Egypt at Tahpanhes. But the symbolical meaning of this action is not thereby exhausted. Not merely is the laying of the stones significant, but also the place where they are laid,—at the entrance, or opposite Pharaoh’s palace. This palace was built of tiles or bricks: this is indicated by the brick-kiln and the mortar. The throne of the king of Babylon, on the contrary, is set up on large stones. The materials of which the palace and the throne are formed, shadow forth the strength and stability of the kingdom. Pharaoh’s dominion is like crumbling clay, the material of bricks; the throne which Nebuchadnezzar shall set up opposite the clay-building of the Pharaohs rests on large stones,—his rule will be powerful and permanent. According to Jeremiah’s further development of the symbol in ver. 11 ff., Nebuchadnezzar will come to Egypt (the *Kethib* באָה is to be read בָּאָה, “he came down,” to Egypt, נָאָה being construed with the accus.), and will smite the land together with its inhabitants, so that every man will receive his appointed lot, viz. death by pestilence, imprisonment, and the sword, *i.e.* death in battle. On the mode of representation here, cf. xv. 2.—Ver. 12. He shall burn the temples of the gods of Egypt, and carry away the idols. The first person הָצַפְתִּי, for which LXX., Syriac, and Vulgate have the third, must not be meddled with;

it corresponds to שָׁמְתִּי in ver. 10. What Nebuchadnezzar does as Jahveh's servant (עַבְדִּי, ver. 10) is done by God. The suffixes in שָׁרֶפֶם and שָׁבֶם are assigned in such a way that the one is to be referred to the temples, the other to the idols; see on xlviii. 7.—עתָה has been variously interpreted. עַתָּה with the accus. מַעַיל or שְׁלֹמָה means to envelop one's self with a garment, put on a garment, wrap the cloak round; cf. 1 Sam. xxviii. 14, Ps. cix. 19, Isa. lix. 17, etc. This is the meaning of the verb here, as is shown by the clause expressing the comparison. The point of likeness is the easiness of the action. Ewald has very well explained the meaning of the whole: "As easily as any shepherd in the open field wraps himself in his cloak, so will he take the whole of Egypt in his hand, and be able to throw it round him like a light garment, that he may then, thus dressed as it were with booty, leave the land in peace, without a foe,—a complete victor." Other explanations of the word are far-fetched, and lexically untenable.—Ver. 13. In conclusion, mention is further made of the destruction of the famous temple of the Sun at Heliopolis, to show the fulfilment of the prophecy that all Egypt would fall under the power of Nebuchadnezzar. בית שָׁמֶן, "House of the Sun," is the Hebrew rendering of the Egyptian *Pe-râ*, *i.e.* House of the Sun, the sacred name of the city vulgarly called *On*; see on Gen. xli. 45. It lay north-east from Cairo, near the modern village of Matarieh, and thus pretty far inland; it was renowned for its magnificent temple, dedicated to *Râ*, the Sun-god. At the entrance to this building stood several larger and smaller obelisks, of which the two larger, added to the two older ones by Pheron the son of Sesostris, were about 150 feet high. One of these the Emperor Augustus caused to be brought to Rome; the other was thrown down in the year 1160; while one of the more ancient but smaller obelisks still stands in its original position, raising its head in the midst of a beautiful garden over a mass of dense foliage. These obelisks are signified by מִזְבְּחוֹת. The additional clause, "which is in the land of Egypt," does not belong to Beth-shemesh, as if it were appended for the purpose of distinguishing the city so named from Beth-shemesh in the land of Judah; the words are rather connected with מִזְבְּחוֹת, and correspond with אֲלֹהִי מִזְבְּחוֹם in the parallel member of the verse. The obelisks

of the most famous temple of the Egyptian Sun-god are well known as the most splendid representatives of the glory of the Egyptian idolatry: the destruction of these monuments indicates the ruin of all the sanctuaries of the ancient kingdom of the Pharaohs. The last clause is a kind of re-echo from ver. 12a; יְהֹוָה is strengthened by the addition of בָּאֵשׁ for the purpose of giving a sonorous ending to the whole.—The king of Egypt is not named in the prophecy, but according to xliv. 30 it is *Pharaoh-Hophra*, who is to be given into the power of Nebuchadnezzar.

When we inquire as to the fulfilment of this prediction, we find M. Duncker, in his *Gesch. des Alterthums*, i. 841, giving a reply in these words: “Nebuchadnezzar did not fulfil these expectations (of Jeremiah, chap. xlivi. 8-13, xliv. 30, and of Ezekiel, chap. xxix. 32). He contented himself with having repelled the renewed attack of Egypt. The establishment of his dominion in Syria did not depend on his conquering Egypt; but Syria must obey him, throughout its whole extent. The capture of Jerusalem followed the siege of the island-town of Tyre (B.C. 586), the last city that had maintained its independence. The army of the Chaldeans lay thirteen years before Tyre without being able to bring the king Ethbaal (Ithobal) under subjection. At last, in the year 573, a treaty was concluded, in which the Tyrians recognised the supremacy of the king of Babylon.” That Tyre was brought into subjection is inferred by Duncker (in a note, p. 682), first, from the generally accepted statement of Berossus, that the whole of Phœnicia was subdued by Nebuchadnezzar (Josephus’ *Ant.* x. 11. 1, and *contra Ap.* i. 19); secondly, from Josephus’ statement (*contra Ap.* i. 21), that the kings Merbal and Hiram had been brought by the Tyrians from Babylon; and lastly, from the fact that, with the close of the siege, the reign of Ithobal ends and that of Baal begins. “It would thus appear that Ithobal was removed, and his family carried to Babylon.” These facts, which are also acknowledged by Duncker, sufficiently show (what we have already pointed out in Ezekiel) that the siege of Tyre ended with the taking of this island-city. For, unless the besieged city had been taken by storm, or at least compelled to surrender, the king would not have let himself be dethroned

and carried to Babylon.—But whence has Duncker derived the information that Nebuchadnezzar had no concern with the subjugation of Egypt, but merely with the establishment of his authority in Syria? Although Nebuchadnezzar began the siege of the island-city of Tyre soon after the destruction of Jerusalem, and required thirteen years to reduce it, yet it does not by any means follow from this that he had only to do with the strengthening of his authority in Syria, and no connection with the subjugation of Egypt; all that we can safely infer is, that he thought he could not attempt the conquest of Egypt with any certain prospect of success until he had subdued the whole of Syria. Besides, so long as such an one as Pharaoh-Hophra occupied the throne of Egypt,—who had not only sent an army to Zedekiah king of Judah to raise the siege of Jerusalem, but also (according to Herodotus, ii. 161, who draws from Egyptian sources) led an army to Sidon and fought a naval battle with the Tyrians; who (as Diod. Sic. i. 68 relates, also following Egyptian tradition) set out for Cyprus with abundant war-material and a strong army and fleet, and took Sidon by storm, while the rest of the towns submitted through fear; who, moreover, had defeated the Phœnicians and Cyprians in a naval engagement, and had returned to Egypt with immense spoil;—how could Nebuchadnezzar possibly think that his rule in Syria was firmly established? Such statements as those now referred to even Duncker does not venture to reject. We must, however, view them with a regard to the usual exaggerations by which the Egyptians were accustomed to extol the deeds of their Pharaohs; but after making all due allowance, we are led to this, that, after the fall of Tyre, Hophra sought to prevent the island of Cyprus as well as Tyre from becoming a dependency of Nebuchadnezzar. Could Nebuchadnezzar leave unmolested such an enemy as this, who, on the first suitable opportunity, would attempt to wrest the whole of Syria from him? So short-sighted a policy we could not attribute to such a conqueror as Nebuchadnezzar. Much more considerate is the judgment previously expressed regarding this by Vitringa, on Isa. xix.: “*Etiamsi omnis historia hic sileret, non est probabile, Nebucadnezarem magnum dominatorem gentium, post Palæstinam et Phœniciam subactam, non tentasse*

Egyptum, et si tentaverit, tentasse frustra ; et quā parte Agyptum occupavit, eam non vastasse et desolasse."

It is also to be borne in mind that the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, which is denied by Hitzig and Graf as well as Duncker, as it formerly was by Volney, is vouched for by the trustworthy testimony of Berossus (in Josephus, *contra Ap.* i. 19), who says that Nebuchadnezzar took Egypt (*κρατήσας Αἰγύπτου, Ἀραβίας, κ.τ.λ.*); the denial, too, rests on a mere inference from the account given by Herodotus from the traditions of the priests regarding the reign of Apriēs (Hophra). If the witness of Berossus regarding the conquest of Syria and Phoenicia be trustworthy, why should his testimony concerning Egypt be unreliable? The account of Josephus (*Ant.* x. 9. 7), that Nebuchadnezzar, in the fifth year after the capture of Jerusalem, and the twenty-third year of his reign, invaded Egypt, killed the king (Hophra), put another in his place, and led captive to Babylon the Jews that had fled to Egypt,—this account will not admit of being brought forward (as has often been attempted, and anew, of late, by Mrc. von Niebuhr, *Assur und Babel*, S. 215) as sufficient testimony for a successful campaign carried on by Nebuchadnezzar against Egypt during the siege of Tyre. The difficulty in the way of proving that such a campaign actually took place is not so much that the death of Hophra in battle with Nebuchadnezzar, or his execution afterwards, contradicts all authenticated history, as that the particular statements of Josephus regarding this campaign, both as to the date and the carrying away to Babylon of the Jews that had fled to Egypt, are simply conclusions drawn from a combination of *Jer.* xlivi. 8-13 and xliv. 30 with *Jer.* lii. 20; besides, the execution of King Hophra by Nebuchadnezzar is foretold neither by Jeremiah nor by Ezekiel. Ezekiel, in chap. xxix.-xxxii., merely predicts the decline of the Egyptian influence, the breaking of the arm of Pharaoh, *i.e.* of his military power, and his fall into Sheol; but he does it in so ideal a manner, that even the words of xxx. 13, "there shall be no more a prince out of the land of Egypt,"—*i.e.* Egypt shall lose all her princes, just as her idols have been destroyed,—even these words cannot well be applied to the execution of Pharaoh-Hophra. But Jeremiah, in chap. xlivi. and in xlvi. 13 ff., predicts merely

the downfall of the pride and power of Pharaoh, and the conquest, devastation, and spoiling of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. And even in the words of xliv. 30, “I (Jahveh) will deliver Pharaoh-Hophra into the hand of his enemies, and of those who seek his life, just as I delivered Zedekiah the king of Judah into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar his enemy, and of those who sought after his life,” there is nothing definitely stated regarding Hophra’s being executed by Nebuchadnezzar, or killed in battle with him. Such a reference cannot be made out from the words, even though we lay no emphasis on the plural “his enemies,” in contrast with the expression “Nebuchadnezzar his enemy,” and, according to xlvi. 26, understand Nebuchadnezzar and his servants as being included under the “enemies;” for certainly Zedekiah was not killed by Nebuchadnezzar, but merely taken prisoner and carried to Babylon. Besides, there was no need of special proof that the prophecies of Jeremiah regarding Egypt declare much more important matters than merely an expedition of Chaldean soldiers to Egypt, as well as the plunder of some cities and the carrying away of the Jews who resided there; and that, in chap. xliv., what the Jews who went to Egypt against the will of God are threatened with, is not transportation to Babylon, but destruction in Egypt by sword, hunger, and pestilence, until only a few individuals shall escape, and these shall return to Judah (xliv. 14, 27, 28).

But if we compare with the prophecy of Jeremiah in chap. xlvi. 8-13, and in xlvi. 13-26, that of Ezekiel in chap. xxix. 17-21, which was uttered or composed in the twenty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, *i.e.* in the year 573, it becomes abundantly evident that Nebuchadnezzar cannot have invaded and conquered Egypt before that year, and not till after the fall of Tyre, which immediately ensued. And that this was actually the case, is put beyond doubt by the statement of Herodotus, ii. 161 ff., regarding Apriës, that he lost his throne and his life in consequence of being defeated in battle with the Cyrenians. What Herodotus assigns as the cause of the fall of Apriës, is insufficient to account for the unhappy end of this king. Herodotus himself states, ii. 169, that the Egyptians were filled with the most intense hatred

against Apriës; the monuments also bear witness to this fact. This bitter feeling must have had a deeper source than merely the unsuccessful issue of a war with Cyrene; it receives its explanation only when we find that Apriës, by his attempts against Nebuchadnezzar, had deserved and brought on the subjugation of Egypt by the king of Babylon; cf. Hävernick on Ezekiel, p. 500. By sending an auxiliary army to Judah, for the purpose of driving back the Chaldeans, and by forming an expedition to Cyprus and the cities of Phœnicia, which was evidently directed against the establishment of the Chaldean power in Phœnicia, Apriës had so provoked the king of Babylon, that the latter, immediately after the subjugation of Tyre, entered on the campaign against Egypt, which he invaded, subdued, and spoiled, without, however, killing the king; him he preferred allowing to rule on, but as his vassal, and under the promise that he would recognise his authority and pay tribute, just as had been done with King Jehoiakim when Jerusalem was first taken. If all this actually took place (which we may well assume), Apriës might probably have begun another war against Cyrene, after the Chaldeans had departed, in the hope of procuring some small compensation to the Egyptians for the defeat they had suffered from the Chaldeans, by subduing that province in the west; in this war the king might have lost his life, as Herodotus relates, through want of success in his attempt. In this way, the account of Herodotus regarding the death of Apriës quite agrees with the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. But that Herodotus makes no mention of the conquest of Egypt, is sufficiently accounted for when we remember that he derived his information from the stories of the priests, who carefully omitted all mention of a struggle between Egypt and the power of Chaldea, since this had ended in the humiliation of Egypt; hence also mention was made only of the victories and mighty deeds of Necho II., while his defeat at Carchemish was passed over in silence.

Chap. xliv. *Warning against Idolatry, and Intimation of its Punishment.*

When the Jews had settled down in Egypt in different places, they betook themselves zealously to the worship of the

queen of heaven ; to this they were probably induced by the example of the heathen round about them, and by the vain expectation of thereby promoting their interests as members of the community (cf. ver. 17 ff.). Accordingly, when all the people who were living here and there through the country had assembled in Upper Egypt (ver. 15) for the celebration of a festival, the prophet seized the opportunity of setting before them, in an earnest manner, the ruinous consequences of their doings. First of all, he reminds them of the judgments which they and their fathers, by their continued apostasy from the Lord, and by their idolatry, had brought on Jerusalem and Judah (vers. 2-7) ; and he warns them not to bring destruction on the remnant of Judah still left, by continuing in their idolatry (vers. 8-10). The threatening also is expressed, that the Lord will destroy all those who marched to Egypt with the sword, famine, and pestilence (vers. 11-14). But the whole assembly declare to him that they will not obey his word, but persist in worshipping the queen of heaven ; alleging that their fathers prospered so long as they honoured her, and war and famine had come on them only after they ceased to do so (vers. 15-19). Jeremiah refutes this false notion (vers. 20-23), and once more solemnly announces to them the sentence of destruction by sword and famine in Egypt. As a sign that the Lord will keep His word, he finally predicts that King Hophra shall be delivered into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar.

Ver. 1. "The word that came to Jeremiah regarding all the Jews who were living in the land of Egypt, who dwelt in Migdol, in Tahpanhes, in Noph, and in the land of Pathros." From this heading we perceive that those who (according to chap. xlivi.) had gone to Egypt, had settled there in various parts of the country, and that the following denunciations, which at the same time form his last prophecy, were uttered a long time after that which is given in xlivi. 8-13 as having been delivered at Tahpanhes. The date of it cannot, indeed, be determined exactly. From the threatening that King Hophra shall be delivered over to the power of Nebuchadnezzar (vers. 24-30), only this much is clear, that Egypt was not yet occupied by the Chaldeans, which, as we have shown above

(p. 154), did not take place before the year 572. But it by no means follows from this that Jeremiah did not utter these words of threatening till shortly before this event. He may have done so even five or ten years before, in the period between 585 and 580, as we have already observed on p. 17, vol. i. The Jews had settled down, not merely in the two northern frontier towns, *Migdol* (i.e. *Magdolo*, *Μαγδώλος*, according to the *Itiner. Anton.*, twelve Roman miles from Pelusium, Copt. *Meschtól*, Egypt. *Ma'ktr*, the most northerly place in Egypt; see on Ezek. xxix. 10) and *Tahpanhes* (i.e. *Daphne*, see on xliii. 7), but also in more inland places, in *Noph* (i.e. *Memphis*, see on ii. 16) and the land of *Pathros* (LXX. *Παθούρης*, Egypt. *Petorēs*, i.e. *Southland*, viz. Upper Egypt, the *Thebais* of the Greeks and Romans; see on Ezek. xxix. 14). The word of the Lord runs as follows:—

Vers. 2-14. *The warning and threatening.*—“ Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Ye yourselves have seen all the evil which I have brought on Jerusalem, and on all the cities of Judah; and, behold, they are a desolation this day, and there is no inhabitant in them; Ver. 3. Because of their wickedness which they have done, by provoking me through going to burn incense, (and) to serve other gods whom they knew not, (neither) they (nor) ye, nor your fathers. Ver. 4. And I sent unto you all my servants the prophets, rising early and sending (them), to say, Do not this abominable thing which I hate. Ver. 5. But they did not hear, nor inclined their ear to turn from their wickedness, by not burning incense to other gods. Ver. 6. Therefore my wrath and mine anger poured itself out, and burned up the cities of Judah and the streets of Jerusalem; so that they have become a desolation and a waste, as at this day. Ver. 7. Now therefore thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Why do ye great evil against your souls, by cutting off from yourselves man and woman, child and suckling, out of the midst of Judah, so leaving no remnant for yourselves; Ver. 8. Through provoking me by the works of your hands, burning incense to other gods in the land of Egypt, whither ye have gone to sojourn, that ye might bring destruction on yourselves, and that ye might become a curse and a reproach among all the nations of the

earth? Ver. 9. Have ye forgotten the evil deeds of your fathers, and the evil deeds of the kings of Judah, and the evil deeds of their wives, and your own evil deeds, and the evil deeds of your wives, which they committed in the land of Judah and on the streets of Jerusalem? Ver. 10. They have not been contrite to this day, and are not afraid, nor do they walk in my law, and in my statutes, which I have set before you and before your fathers. Ver. 11. Therefore thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Behold, I will set my face against you for evil, and to cut off all Judah. Ver. 12. And I will take the remnant of Judah, that have set their faces to go to the land of Egypt in order to sojourn there, and they shall all be consumed; in the land of Egypt shall they fall, by sword and famine shall they be consumed; small and great, by sword and famine shall they die, and they shall become an execration and an astonishment, and a curse and a reproach. Ver. 13. And I will punish those who dwell in the land of Egypt, as I punished Jerusalem, by sword, and famine, and pestilence. Ver. 14. There shall not be one escaped or left to the remnant of Judah that came to sojourn there in the land of Egypt, so as to return to the land of Judah, whither they long to return and dwell; for they shall not return except [as] escaped ones."

In order to make an impression on the people by his warning against idolatry, Jeremiah begins his address with a reference to the great calamity which the fathers have brought on the kingdom of Judah through their continued idolatry (vers. 2-6). "Ye have seen all the evil," etc.; all the cities are laid waste and depopulated, because their inhabitants have roused the anger of the Lord, and have not let themselves be dissuaded by the admonitions of the prophets whom God has sent. "This day," i.e. now, at present. On ver. 3, cf. xi. 17, xix. 4, xxxii. 32, etc.; and as to the meaning of **טְרִיכָה**, see on i. 16. In ver. 3b the address becomes more direct, through the change into the second person, "ye;" the audience then present only continue these sins of their fathers. On ver. 4, cf. vii. 25, xxv. 4, etc. **טְרִיכָה חַטֹּאת**, "the thing of this abomination," which is equivalent to "this abominable idolatry." **טְרִיכָה** serves to render the subject more prominent, as in Judg. xix. 24. On ver. 6, cf. xlvi. 18, vii. 20. The wrath

of God burned in the cities, for the fire of destruction was a manifestation of the divine wrath. As to פִּיּוֹם הַנֶּהָרָה, see on xi. 5. In vers. 7-10 follows the application of what has been said to those present, who are asked how they come to continue in the old sins, to their own destruction, "doing evil in regard to your souls," *i.e.* for the injury, destruction of your souls, yourself; cf. xxvi. 19, where עַלְנֵנִי stands for אַלְנֵנִי. This is immediately afterwards more exactly specified by וְנִכְרֵת וְנִכְרֵת, to exterminate the whole of you, without an exception. As to the enumeration "man and woman," etc., cf. 1 Sam. xv. 3, xxii. 19. The infs. לְהַבְעִיכְנִי and לְקַטֵּר are used as gerundives: "inasmuch as (through this that) ye provoke me." For the expression "the works of your hands," see on i. 16. In ver. 8, an object must be supplied from ver. 7 for the expression לְמַעַן הַכְּרִית לְכָם; for, to take לְכָם (with Hitzig) in a reflexive sense is a very harsh construction. On לְלִילָה וְנִכְרֵת, cf. xlvi. 18, xxvi. 6. The answer to the question now asked follows in vers. 9 and 10, in the form of the further question, whether they have forgotten those former sins, and that these sins have been the cause of the evil which has befallen the land. The interrogation expresses the reproach that they have been able to forget both, as is evidenced by their continuance in sin. In ver. 9, the expression "the evil deeds of *his* wives" (נְשֵׁין) is remarkable. Hitzig and Nägelsbach, following Kimchi, refer the suffix to the kings, since there was always but one king at a time. But this is an unnatural explanation; the suffix refers to Judah as a nation, and is used in order to comprehend the wives of the fathers and of the kings together. It is quite arbitrary in Ewald and Graf to change שָׂרֵי to נְשֵׁין, following the LXX. τῶν ἀρχόντων ὑμῶν; for these translators have mutilated the text by the omission of the following רְעוּתיכֶם. וְאַתָּה רְעוּתיכֶם is not merely conserved, but even required, by וְאַתָּה רְעוּת נְשֵׁיכֶם. But the prophet gives special prominence to the evil deeds of the wives, since it was they who were most zealous in worshipping the queen of heaven; cf. vers. 15 and 19. לֹא דָפְאָו, "they have not been crushed," viz. by repentance and sorrow for these sins. The transition to the third person is not merely accounted for by the fact that the subject treated of is the sins of the fathers and of the present generation,—for,

as is shown by the expression “ till this day,” the prophet has chiefly his own contemporaries in view; but he speaks of these in the third person, to signify the indignation with which he turns away from men so difficult to reform. On the expression, “they had not walked in my law,” cf. xxvi. 4, ix. 12. For this the Lord will punish them severely, vers. 11–14. All those who have fled to Egypt, with the intention of remaining there, will be quite exterminated. On “Behold, I will set my face,” etc., cf. xxi. 10. “For evil” is more exactly defined by “to cut off all Judah,” *i.e.* those of Judah who are in Egypt, not those who are in Babylon. This limitation of the words “all Judah” is necessarily required by the context, and is plainly expressed in ver. 12, where “Judah” is specified as “the remnant of Judah that were determined to go to Egypt.” **לְקַחְתִּי** has the meaning of taking away, as in xv. 15. **בְּלָ** are to be taken by themselves; and **בַּאֲרָצֵן מִצְרָיִם**, as is shown by the accents, is to be attached to what follows, on which, too, the emphasis is placed; in like manner, **בְּחַרְבָּ וְנוּ'** are to be attached to the succeeding verb. The arrangement of the words, like the accumulation of sentences all expressing the same meaning, reveals the spirit of the address in which God vents His wrath. On “they shall become an execration,” etc., see xlvi. 18. In vers. 13, 14, the threatened extermination is further set forth. Those who dwell in Egypt shall be punished with sword, famine, and plague, like Jerusalem. The inhabitants of Egypt generally are meant; and by the judgment which is to fall on that country, the remnant of Judah there shall be so completely destroyed, that none shall escape. The leading member of the sentence is continued by **וְלִשְׁבַּבְ**, “and that they should return to the land of Judah, after which their soul longs, that they may live there.” A reason is further assigned, and with this the address, reduced within becoming limits, concludes: “for there shall return none except (**בְּאַם**) fugitives,” *i.e.* except a few individual fugitives who shall come back. This last clause shows that we are not to understand the declaration “none shall escape” in the strictest meaning of the words. Those who escape and return to Judah shall be so few, in comparison with those who shall perish in Egypt, as to be quite inconsiderable. Cf. the like instance of a

seeming contradiction in vers. 27, 28. On נָשָׁא אֶת־נְפָשָׁם, cf. xxii. 27.

Vers. 15-19. *The answer of the people to this threatening address.*—Ver. 15. “Then all the men who knew that their wives burned incense to other gods, and all the women standing [there], a great multitude, and all the people who dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, Ver. 16. [As for] the word which thou hast spoken unto us in the name of Jahveh, we will not hearken unto thee: Ver. 17. But we will certainly perform every word that has proceeded out of our own mouth, by burning incense to the queen of heaven, and pouring out libations to her, just as we have done, we and our fathers, our kings and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; and we were filled with bread, and became prosperous, and saw no evil. Ver. 18. But since we ceased to offer incense to the queen of heaven, and to pour out libations to her, we have been in want of everything, and are consumed by sword and famine. Ver. 19. And when we [women] have been burning incense to the queen of heaven, and poured out libations to her, have we made cakes to her without our husbands, making an image of her, and offering libations to her?” To the word of the prophet the men and women oppose their pretended experience, that the adoration of the queen of heaven has brought them comfort and prosperity, while the neglect of this worship, on the other hand, has brought want and misfortune. No doubt they inferred this, by the argument *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*, from the fact that, after idolatry had been rooted out by Josiah, adversity had befallen the land of Judah; while, up till that time, the kingdom of Judah had been independent, and, for more than a century before, had been spared the suffering of misfortune. Thus, through their blindness, peculiar to the natural man, they had overlooked the minor transient evils with which the Lord visits His people when they sin. Not till near the end of Josiah’s reign did misfortune fall on Judah: this was when the Egyptian army, under Pharaoh-Necho, marched through Palestine; Josiah was slain in the battle he had lost, the land was laid waste by the enemy, and its inhabitants perished by sword and famine. In ver. 15, those

who are represented speaking are all the men who knew of their wives' idolatry, *i.e.* who permitted it, and all the women, "a great company," *i.e.* gathered together in great numbers, and all the rest of the people who lived in Egypt. The specification "in Pathros" is not in apposition to the words "in the land of Egypt," but belongs to the verb גָּיַעַת; it tells where the gathering took place, viz. in a district of Upper Egypt. From the presence of a large number of women, we may conclude that the assembly was a festival in honour of the queen of heaven. The former portion of ver. 16 forms an absolute clause, from בַּשְׂמָךְ to קָרְבָּן, "as regards the word which . . . we will not listen to thee," *i.e.* with regard to this word we obey thee not. The expression, "the word which has gone forth out of our mouth," points to the uttering of vows: cf. Num. xxx. 3, 13; Deut. xxiii. 24. **כָּל־הָרָבָר אֲנַצֵּר וּנו'** means "all that we have uttered as a vow," every vow to offer incense, etc., *i.e.* to present meat and drink offerings to the queen of heaven,—that shall we keep, fulfil, as we and our fathers have done in the land of Judah. On this mode of worship, cf. vii. 17 f., and the remarks there made. "And we were satisfied with bread," *i.e.* in consequence of this worship we had amply sufficient food. טֹבִים, "good," well, comfortable; cf. xxii. 16. מִן אֵז, "from that time" = since. תְּמִימָנָה is for תְּמִימָנָה, from פְּמָמָה, as in Num. xvii. 28; cf. Ewald, § 197, *a*. To this statement on the part of the men, the women further add, ver. 19, that they do not engage in this sacrificial worship or prepare the sacrificial cakes without their husbands, *i.e.* without their knowledge and approval. This is put forward by the women in the way of self-vidication; for, according to the law, Num. xxx. 9 ff., the husband could annul, *i.e.* declare not binding, any vow which had been made by his wife without his knowledge. Although it is women who are speaking, the *masc.* מְקֻטְרִים is used as being the gender which most commonly occurs; it also pretty often stands for the feminine. The *inf. constr.* אַלְחַפֵּךְ (with **ך**) is here employed, in conformity with later usage, instead of the *inf. abs.*, for the finite verb, by way of continuation; cf. Ewald, § 351, *c*, where, however, many passages have been set down as falling under this rule that demand a different explanation. The meaning of לְהַעֲצֵבָה is disputed; the

final נ is a suffix, written with Raphe, though Mappik also occurs in some MSS. The Hiphil of this verb is found elsewhere only in Ps. lxxviii. 40, and there in the signification of vexing, grieving, like the Piel in Isa. lxiii. 10, Ps. lvi. 6. Ewald translates “in order to move her,” *i.e.* make her well-disposed,—but quite arbitrarily, for to provoke is the very opposite of rendering propitious. The verb בָּצַע also signifies “to form, shape,” Job x. 8; and in this sense the Hiphil is used here, “in order to put them into shape,” *i.e.* to form the moon-goddess (queen of heaven) in or on the sacrificial cakes (Kimchi, Raschi, Dahler, Maurer, Graf, etc.). The sacrificial cakes (מִנְבָּרֶת, see on vii. 18) probably had the form of a crescent, or even of the full moon, like the *σελῆναι* of the Greeks, which used to be offered in Athens at the time of the full moon in the month of Munychion, to Artemis, as goddess of the moon; cf. Hermann, *gottesdienstliche Alterthümer der Griechen*, 2 Ausg. S. 146, Anm. 13, u. S. 414.

Vers. 20-23. *Refutation of these statements of the people.*—Ver. 20. “And Jeremiah spake to all the people, to the men and women, and to all the people that had given him answer, saying, Ver. 21. Did not the incense-burning which ye performed in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, ye and your fathers, your kings and your princes, and the people of the land,—did not Jahveh remember them, and did it not arise in His mind? Ver. 22. And Jahveh could no longer endure it, because of the wickedness of your deeds, because of the abominations which ye committed; thus your land became a desolation, and a waste, and a curse, without an inhabitant, as at this day. Ver. 23. Because ye burned incense and sinned against Jahveh, and did not hearken to the voice of Jahveh, and in His law, in His statutes, and in His testimonies ye walked not; therefore this evil hath befallen you, as at this day.” Jeremiah answers them that their idol-worship, by which they have provoked the Lord their God, is the very cause of the misfortune that has befallen them, because God could no longer endure this abomination which they would not forsake. בְּעֵנָת is a noun, “the burning of incense,” which includes, besides, all the other elements of idolatrous worship; hence the word is resumed, at the close, under the plur. מִנִּים, “these

things." **וְתַعַלְתָּה** is 3d pers. sing. neut., lit. "it has come into His mind," *i.e.* He has carefully considered it, and that in the way of punishment, for He could no longer endure such abomination. The imperf. **יָכַל** is used for the historic tense (imperf. with 1 consec.), because the 1 would necessarily be separated from the verb by the **וְ**; and it is employed instead of the perfect, which we would be inclined to expect after the preceding **בָּכַר**, since that which is treated of is something that endures for a considerable time; cf. Ewald, § 346, *b*. On the expression "because of the evil," etc., cf. xxi. 12, iv. 4, etc.; on the last clause in ver. 22, cf. vers. 6 and 12.—Ver. 23 is an emphatic and brief repetition of what has already been said. **תָּהַרְתָּ** is for **תָּהַרְתָּה**, as in Deut. xxxi. 29: cf. Gesenius, § 74, note 1; Ewald, § 194, *b*.

Vers. 24–30. *Announcement of the punishment for this idolatry.*—Ver. 24. "And Jeremiah said unto all the people, and unto all the women, Hear the word of Jahveh, all of Judah that are in the land of Egypt; Ver. 25. Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: Ye and your wives have both spoken with your mouth, and fulfilled it with your hands, saying, We will assuredly perform our vows which we have vowed, by burning incense to the queen of heaven, and by pouring out libations to her: ye will by all means perform your vows, and carry out your vows. Ver. 26. Therefore hear the word of Jahveh, all Judah that dwell in the land of Egypt: Behold, I have sworn by my great name, saith Jahveh, truly my name shall no more be named in the mouth of any man of Judah, saying, 'As the Lord Jahveh liveth,' in all the land of Egypt. Ver. 27. Behold, I will watch over them for evil, and not for good; and all the men of Judah that are in the land of Egypt shall be consumed by the sword and by famine, till they are annihilated. Ver. 28. And those who escape the sword shall return out of the land of Egypt to the land of Judah, a small number; and all the remnant of Judah, that went to the land of Egypt to sojourn there, shall know whose word shall stand, mine or theirs. Ver. 29. And this shall be the sign to you, saith Jahveh, that I will punish you in this place, that ye may know that my words shall surely rise up against you for evil: Ver. 30. Thus hath Jahveh

spoken, Behold, I will give Pharaoh-Hophra into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of those who seek his life, just as I have given Zedekiah the king of Judah into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon, who was his enemy, and sought his life."

After refuting the false assertion of the people, Jeremiah once more announces to them, on behalf of God, in the most solemn manner, the punishment of extermination by sword and famine in Egypt; this he does for the purpose of giving the greatest possible emphasis to his warning against persevering in idolatry. For substance, this announcement is similar to that of vers. 11-14, but the expression is stronger. Even in the summary account of their offences, ver. 25, the words are so chosen and arranged as to bring out clearly the determination of the people to persevere in worshipping the queen of heaven. "As for you and your wives, ye have spoken with your mouth and fulfilled it with your hand" (on the *Vav consec.* attached to תִּדְבְּרָנִי, cf. Ewald, § 344, *b*), *i.e.* ye have uttered vows and then carried them out; for ye say, We must keep the vows that we have vowed. It is to be observed that the verbs תִּדְבְּרָנִי, and in the concluding portion תִּקְיְמָנִה and תִּעְשְׂיָנִה, are feminine, since the address chiefly applies to the wives, who clung most tenaciously to idolatry. In the clause הַקִּים תִּקְיְמָנָה וְנוּ, "ye will make your vows and perform them," there is unmistakeable irony, in which the reference is to the wilfulness of the people in this idolatry. This *έθελοθρησκεία* is shown by the inf. abs. הַקִּים, which strengthens תִּקְיְמָנָה. "To establish vows," *i.e.* to make them, was not a thing commanded, but left to one's free determination. Hence, also, no appeal to the maxim that vows which have been made or uttered must be fulfilled, can justify the making of the vows. The form תִּקְיְמָנָה for קִיְמָנָה is an unusual one; and the ' which the Hirik takes after it is occasioned by the form הַקִּים; cf. Ewald, § 196, *c*.—The announcement of the punishment is introduced by a solemn oath on the part of God. Jahveh swears by His great name, *i.e.* as the one who has shown Himself God by His mighty deeds—who has the power of keeping His word. The name is, of course, only a manifestation of His existence. נִאֶן as a particle used in swearing = certainly not. His name shall no more be named in the

mouth of any Jew in the land of Egypt, *i.e.* be used in asseverations, because all the Jews in Egypt shall be exterminated. On the expression, "Behold, I will watch over them," etc., cf. xxxi. 28 and xxi. 10. In ver. 28, it is more exactly stated that only a few individuals shall escape the sword and return to Judah; thus, no one shall remain behind in Egypt. By this judgment, all the remnant of Judah that went to Egypt shall find out whose word—Jahveh's or theirs—will endure, *i.e.* prove true. מִמֶּנִּי וּמִמֶּנָּה properly depends on בְּרִיךְ, "the word from me or from them" (the people).—Ver. 29. In confirmation of this threatening, the Lord gives them another sign which, when it is fulfilled, will let them know that the destruction announced to them shall certainly befall them. The token consists in the giving up of King Hophra into the hand of his enemies. As certainly as this shall take place, so certainly shall the extermination of the Jews in Egypt ensue. The name Ὀὐάφρις is rendered *Ováphrís* in Manetho, in the classical writers *Ἀπρίης, Apriēs*, who, according to Herodotus (ii. 161), reigned twenty-five years, but nineteen according to Manetho (cf. Boeckh, *Manetho*, etc., p. 341 ff.). His death took place in the year 570 B.C. This date is reached by a comparison of the following facts:—Cambyses conquered Egypt in the year 525; and in the preceding year Amasis had died, after a reign of forty-four years (Herod. iii. 10). Hence Amasis—who took Apriēs prisoner, and gave him up to the common people, who killed him (Herod. ii. 161–163, 169)—must have commenced his reign in the year 570. On the death of Apriēs, or Hophra, cf. the explanation given on p. 154 f., where we have shown that the words, "I will give him into the hand of his enemies, and of those who seek his life," when compared with what is said of Zedekiah, "into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar his enemy," do not require us to assume that Hophra was killed by Nebuchadnezzar, and can very well be harmonized with the notice of Herodotus regarding the death of this king.

Hitzig and Graf have taken objection to this sign given by Jeremiah, and regard vers. 29, 30 as a spurious *vaticinium ex eventu*, the work of another hand. The reasons they urge are, that it is scarcely possible Jeremiah could have lived till 570; that ver. 29 f. would be the only place where Jeremiah offered

such a criterion ; and that, even as it is, these verses contain nothing original, but, by their stiff and lifeless parallelism, are easily seen to be an artificial conclusion. Of these three arguments, the last can prove nothing, since it is merely a subjective opinion on an æsthetic point. The second, again, rather declares for than against the genuineness. For “if it were not Jeremiah’s usual, elsewhere, to offer some criterion, then such an interpolation would have been all the more carefully avoided” (Nägelsbach). Of course we do not find any other signs of this kind in Jeremiah ; but it does not follow from this that he could not offer such a thing in a special case. Yet the ground taken up by Nägelsbach, as sufficient to establish this position, seems quite untenable, viz. that the announcement of the fate in store for the king must have been the answer of the true God to the presumptuous boast of Apriës, mentioned by Herodotus, “that even God could not dethrone him, so firmly did he think he was established :” this view of the matter seems too remote from the object of Jeremiah’s address. And finally, the first-named objection receives importance only on the supposition that “an event which was intended to serve as **נִזְנָה**, a sign or criterion, must be something that was to happen immediately, or within a brief appointed period of time, so that a person might be able, from the occurrence of the one, to conclude that what had been foretold about a later period would as certainly take place” (Graf). But there are no sufficient grounds for this hypothesis. If no definite time be fixed for the occurrence of this sign, then it may not appear till a considerable time afterwards, and yet be a pledge for the occurrence of what was predicted for a still later period. That Jeremiah lived till the year 570 is certainly not inconceivable, but it is not likely that he uttered the prophecy now before us at the advanced age of nearly eighty years. Now, if his address is allowed to be a real prophecy, and not a mere *vaticinium ex eventu*, as Hitzig, looking from his dogmatic standpoint, considers it, then it must have been uttered before the year 570 ; but whether this was two, or five, or ten years before, makes no material difference. The address itself contains nothing to justify the assumption of Graf, that it is closely connected with the prophecy in xlivi. 8-13, and with the warning against the migration into Egypt,

chap. xlvi. That the Jews spoken of had not been long in Egypt, cannot be inferred from vers. 8, 12, and 18; on the contrary, the fact that they had settled down in different parts of Egypt, and had assembled at Pathros for a festival, shows that they had been living there for a considerable time before. Nor does it follow, from the statement in ver. 14 that they longed to return to Judah, that they had gone to Egypt some months before. The desire to return into the land of their fathers remains, in a measure, in the heart of the Jew even at the present day. After all, then, no valid reason can be assigned for doubting the genuineness of these verses.

On the fulfilment of these threatenings Nägelsbach remarks: "Every one must be struck on finding that, in chap. xliv., the extermination of the Jews who dwelt in Egypt is predicted; while some centuries later, the Jews in Egypt were very numerous, and that country formed a central point for the Jewish exiles (cf. Herzog, *Real-Encycl.* xvii. S. 285). Alexander the Great found so many Jews in Egypt, that he peopled with Jews, in great measure, the city he had founded and called after himself (cf. Herzog, i. S. 235). How did these Jews get to Egypt? Whence the great number of Jews whom Alexander found already in Egypt? I am inclined to think that we must consider them, for the most part, as the descendants of those who had come into the country with Jeremiah. But, according to this view of the matter, Jeremiah's prophecy has not been fulfilled." Nägelsbach therefore thinks we must assume that idolatrous worship, through time, almost entirely ceased among the exiled Jews in Egypt as it did among those in Babylon, and that the Lord then, in return, as regards the penitents, repented of the evil which He had spoken against them (xxvi. 13, 19). But this whole explanation is fundamentally wrong, since the assertion, that Alexander the Great found so many Jews in Egypt, that with them mainly he peopled the city of Alexandria which he had founded, is contrary to historic testimony. In Herzog (*Real-Encycl.* i. S. 235), to which Nägelsbach refers for proof on the point, nothing of the kind is to be found, but rather the opposite, viz. the following: "Soon after the foundation of Alexandria by Alexander the Great, this city became not merely the centre of Jewish Hellenism in Egypt, but generally

speaking the place of union between Oriental and Occidental Jews. The external condition of the Jews of Alexandria must, on the whole, be characterized as highly prosperous. The first Jewish settlers had, indeed, been compelled by Alexander the Great to take up their residence in the city (Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 3. 1); so, too, were other Jews, by Ptolemy I. or Lagi (*ibid.* xii. 2. 4). But both of these monarchs granted them the same rights and privileges as the Macedonians, including Greek citizenship; and in consequence of the extremely advantageous position of the city, it speedily increased in importance. A still larger number, therefore, soon went thither of their own accord, and adopted the Greek language." In this account, the quotation from Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 3. 1, is certainly incorrect; for neither is there in that passage any testimony borne to the measures attributed to Alexander, nor are there any other historical testimonies given from antiquity. But as little can we find any proofs that Alexander the Great found so many Jews in Egypt that he could, to a large extent, people with them the city he had founded. It is merely testified by Josephus (*Antt.* xi. 8. 5), and by Hecataeus in Josephus (*contra Ap.* i. 22; p. 457, ed. Haverc.), that Alexander had Jewish soldiers in his army; it is further evident, from a notice in Josephus, *de bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7, *contra Ap.* ii. 4 (cf. Curtius Rufus, iv. 8), that the newly founded city, even under Alexander, immediately after it was commenced, and still more under Ptolemy Lagi (cf. Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 1, and Hecataeus in *Jos. contra Ap.* i. 22, p. 455), attracted a constantly increasing multitude of Jewish immigrants. This same Ptolemy, after having subdued Phœnicia and Cœle-Syria in the year 320, and taken Jerusalem also, it would seem, by a stratagem on a Sabbath day, transported many captives and hostages out of the whole country into Egypt; many, too, must have been sold at that time as slaves to the inhabitants of such a wealthy country as Egypt: see a statement in the book of *Aristeas*, at the end of Havercamp's edition of Josephus, ii. p. 104. In the same place, and in Josephus' *Antt.* xii. 1, Ptolemy is said to have armed 30,000 Jewish soldiers, placed them as garrisons in the fortresses, and granted them all the rights of Macedonian citizens (*ἰσοπολιτεία*). Ewald well says, *History of the People*

of Israel, vol. iv. of second edition, p. 254 : "When we further take into consideration, that, in addition to all other similar disasters which had previously befallen them, many Jews were removed to Egypt (especially by Ochus, after Egypt had been reconquered), we can easily explain how Ptolemy Philadelphus can be said to have liberated 100,000 Egyptian Jews. *Aristeas' Book*, p. 105." This much, at least, is proved by these various notices,—that, in order to understand how such a vast increase took place in the number of the Jews in Egypt, we do not need to regard them as the descendants of those who removed thither with Jeremiah, and so to question the fulfilment of the prophecy now before us. Jeremiah does not, of course, threaten with destruction all those Jews who live in Egypt, but only those who at that time went thither against the divine will, and there persevered in their idolatry. We do not know how great may have been the number of these immigrants, but they could hardly exceed two thousand,—perhaps, indeed, there were not so many. All these, as had been foretold them, may have perished in the conquest of Egypt by the Chaldeans, and afterwards, through the sword, famine, and pestilence; for the myriads of Jews in Egypt at the time of Ptolemy Lagi could easily have removed thither during the period of 250 years intermediate between the immigration in Jeremiah's time and the foundation of Alexandria, partly as prisoners and slaves, partly through voluntary settlement.

Chap. xlv. *A Promise addressed to Baruch.*

Ver. 1. "The word which Jeremiah the prophet spake to Baruch the son of Neriah, when he wrote these words in a book at the mouth of Jeremiah, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah, saying, Ver. 2. Thus saith Jahveh, the God of Israel, to thee, O Baruch: Ver. 3. Thou saidst, Woe to me now! for Jahveh hath added sorrow to my pain: I am weary with sighing, and no rest do I find. Ver. 4. Thus shalt thou say unto him, Thus saith Jahveh: Behold, what I have built I will destroy, and what I have planted I will pluck up, and that is the whole earth. Ver. 5. And thou seekest great things for thyself; seek them not: for,

behold, I will bring evil on all flesh, saith Jahveh; but I will give thy life unto thee for booty in all places whither thou shalt go."

From the superscription in ver. 1, it appears that this word of God came to Baruch through Jeremiah the prophet, in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim, when Baruch was writing out, or had written out, in a book-roll the prophecies that had been uttered by Jeremiah up till that time. It is not necessarily implied in the *infinitive* בְּכִתְבֵּי that the word of God came during the transcription, while he was still engaged in writing: it may also mean, "when he was ready with the writing," had got done with it; and Hitzig is wrong when he rejects as "misleading" the view which Movers takes—"when he had written." The writing down of the addresses of Jeremiah in the year mentioned is related in chap. xxxvi.; thus the substance of this chapter and that of chap. xxxvi. agree. "These words" can only be the addresses (words) of Jeremiah which Baruch was then writing down. From this, Hitzig, Graf, Nägelsbach, and others, infer that this small piece was the last in the copy of Jeremiah's prophecies originally prepared under Jehoiakim,—if not of the first one which was intended to be read in the temple, at least of the second copy which was made after the former one had been destroyed; and that it was only after the collection had been enlarged to the extent of the collection handed down to us, that this portion was affixed as an appendix to the end of the prophecies of Jeremiah which relate to his own country. But this inference is not a valid one. "These words" are the addresses of the prophet in general, which Baruch wrote down; and that only those which were uttered up to the fourth year of Jehoiakim are intended, is implied, not in the demonstrative "these," but in the date given afterwards, by which "these" is further specified. In ver. 1 it is merely stated that at that time the word of God, given below, came to Jeremiah, and through him to Baruch, but not that Baruch wrote down this also on that occasion, and appended it to the roll of Jeremiah's prophecies which had been prepared at his dictation. It may have been written down much later, possibly not till the whole of Jeremiah's prophecies were collected and arranged in Egypt. Moreover, the position occupied by this chapter in the collection shows

that this message of comfort to Baruch was added as an appendix to those predictions of Jeremiah which concern Judah and Israel.

The occasion for this message of comfort addressed to the prophet's attendant is pointed out in ver. 3, in the words which Baruch had uttered: "Woe to me! for Jahveh adds sorrow to my pain." Baruch felt "pain," *i.e.* pain of soul, at the moral corruption of the people, their impenitence and obduracy in sin and vice, just like the prophet himself, xv. 18. To this pain God adds sorrow, by threatening the judgment which shall fall on Judah for sin, and which was even then beginning to break over the land; cf. viii. 18 ff. Baruch sighs over this till he is wearied, and finds no rest; cf. Lam. v. 5. "I am weary with my sighing," is a reminiscence from Ps. vi. 7. This sorrow in addition to his pain was not caused in him for the first time by writing down the discourses of the prophet, but was rather thus freshened and increased. The answer of the Lord to this sighing is of a stern character, yet soothing for Baruch. The sentence of destruction has been determined on. What the Lord has built He will now destroy: it is not said why, since the reason was sufficiently known from the prophet's utterances. As to the expression in ver. 4, cf. i. 10, xxxi. 28. The destruction regards the whole earth, **כל הארץ היא**, lit. "and as regards the whole earth, it is it," namely that I destroy. On the employment of **היא** in introducing the subject, cf. Dan. ix. 13, Hag. ii. 5, and Ewald, § 277 d. **כל הארץ** does not mean "the whole land," but "the whole earth:" this is indubitably evident from the parallel "upon all flesh," ver. 5, *i.e.* the whole of humanity, as in xxv. 31. The sentence is passed on all the earth, in accordance with the announcement made in chap. xxv. 15 ff.—Ver. 5. But when the judgment extends over the whole of humanity, an individual man cannot ask for anything great. "To seek for great things," *i.e.* to ask for things which in general or under certain circumstances are unattainable (cf. Ps. cxxxii. 1), is here used with reference to worldly prosperity. When the whole world is visited with judgment, an individual man must not make great demands, but be content with saving his life. This is promised to Baruch in ver. 5b, to alleviate his pain

and sorrow. "To give life to any one for booty," means to let him escape with his life; cf. xxi. 9, xxxviii. 2, xxxix. 18. In the words, "in all places whither thou shalt go," it is intimated that he will be obliged to avoid destruction by flight, but will thereby save his life.

IV. PROPHECIES DIRECTED AGAINST FOREIGN NATIONS.— CHAP. XLVI.-LI.

Like Amos, Isaiah, and Ezekiel, Jeremiah has uttered predictions concerning a number of heathen nations, and incorporated them with the collection of his prophecies regarding Judah and Israel. But while in Amos the utterances regarding six nations round about the kingdom of God, as representatives of the whole heathen world, merely pave the way for announcing judgment on Judah and Israel, and are given for the purpose of teaching the necessity for judgment on the whole world that is opposed to God, in order that the kingdom of God may be advanced; Isaiah, on the other hand, when the power of Assyria appeared against the kingdom of God, brought forward the thought, in a pretty long series of oracles against the nations, chap. xiii.-xxiii., that all kingdoms and peoples, cities and men of the world that had apostatized from God, and still continued in apostasy, shall be humbled, and compelled by judgments inflicted on them to seek refuge with the God of Israel,—to submit to Him, and to offer their gifts for the establishment of His kingdom; and he concludes this announcement with an apocalyptic description of the judgment on the whole earth, and the consummation of the kingdom of God in glory, chap. xxiv.-xxvii. The object aimed at by Ezekiel and Jeremiah in their oracles against the heathen nations is more specific. Ezekiel, in view of the destruction of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah, directs a series of oracles against seven nations; and in these addresses he predicts the destruction of the heathen world, and the fall of all heathen powers into Sheol, in order that these may not exult over the fall of the people of God, but rather, in the judgment on Israel, recognise the omnipotence and justice of the Lord, the Judge of all the earth. And Jeremiah, in his addresses to the nations, chap.

xlvi.-li., merely brings out more fully the execution of that sentence which he had already proclaimed (chap. xxv.) to all the peoples and kingdoms of the earth, shortly before the appearance of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon in the fourth year of Jehoiakim's reign. The multitude of nations and tribes, far and near, to which, in xxv. 17-26, he gives the cup of the divine wrath out of Jahveh's hand, is in chap. xlvi.-li. reduced to nine nations; and these are named in such order, that here, as there (chap. xxv.), Egypt heads the list (chap. xlvi.), while Babylon closes it (chap. l., li.). Of the rest of these nations, those related to Israel, viz. Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites, have special prophecies addressed to them, chap. xlvi.ii. and xlix. 1-22; but the others are more summarily addressed. Thus, in the oracle pronounced against the Philistines, the Phœnicians also (Tyre and Sidon) are threatened with extermination (chap. xlvi.ii.); the many Arabian tribes severally named in chap. xxv. are comprehended under the general designations "Kedar" and "the kingdoms of Hazor" (xlii. 28-33); while the kingdoms of the north are represented by Damascus (xlii. 23-27), and the distant nations of the east (Media and Elam) by Elam, xlii. 34-39.

Ewald, Hitzig, Graf, and Nägelsbach would account for several smaller nations being taken together in one prophecy, on the ground that the prophet wished to make out the significant number seven,—just as Amos (i. 1-ii. 5) brings forward seven kingdoms before his address is directed to Israel, and as Ezekiel also has arranged his prophecies against the nations in accordance with the number seven. But though the number seven plainly appears in Amos and Ezekiel, such an assumption cannot be established in the case of Jeremiah. To make out this number, the oracles against Elam and Babylon are viewed as later additions, on the ground that both of them are connected with the first years of the reign of Zedekiah. But the assertion that the first seven belong to the fourth year of Jehoiakim cannot be proved. The second prophecy regarding Egypt (xlii. 14-28), and that against the Philistines (chap. xlvi.ii.), contain, in their headings, indications of the time of composition, which do not point to the fourth year of Jehoiakim. With this also accords the remark further brought to bear on the alleged

composition of those seven prophecies in the fourth year of Jehoiakim,—that this follows, not merely from the general agreement of their contents with chap. xlvi. as well as with chap. xxv., but also from the fact that “the same expressions which the prophet uses in chap. xxv. with reference to the judgment of all nations, are re-echoed in chap. xlvi.—xlix. 33: *e.g.* cf. xxv. 31, 34, with xlvi. 10; xxv. 35 with xlvi. 5, 6; xxv. 29, 31, with xlvi. 6, 7; and particularly xxv. 28, 29, with xlix. 12 (Caspari on Obadiah, p. 16): cf. also xxv. 27 with xlvi. 26; xxv. 30 with xlvi. 33; xxv. 34 with xlix. 20; xxv. 38 with xlix. 19 and xlvi. 16.” For, of all these passages, none belongs to the second prophecy against Egypt (xlvi. 14—28), and to that against the Philistines (chap. xlvi.), except the last-quoted passage, xlvi. 16, in which the expression *חַרְבַּת הַיּוֹנָה* agrees with xxv. 38, if in the latter passage we read *חַרְבַּת* for *חַרְבָּת*. But this expression is also repeated in the oracle against Babylon, l. 16; so that no proof can be drawn, from a consideration of the language employed, to show that the prophecies against Egypt (xlvi. 14—28) and against the Philistines (chap. xlvi.) belong to the same time, as has been supposed. And the assertion that the prophecy against Elam forms an appendix to those which precede, could have been made only by a mind in a state of perplexity. Its position, after that against the Arabian tribes, and before that against Babylon, exactly agrees with the place occupied by Elam in xxv. 5.¹

¹ From the above statement, the propriety and correctness of arrangement among these oracles in the Hebrew text will both be apparent. On the other hand, the transposition made in the Greek text of the LXX. (already referred to in the note on p. 33 of vol. i.) is characterized, even by Ewald and Hitzig, as “arbitrary” and “incorrect.” Ewald remarks: “We cannot find that any other principle was acted upon in their arrangement than that the large portion about Babylon, chap. 1 ff., should be made as prominent as possible; the small piece about the Elamites which precedes it, xlix. 34—39, was put the very first, probably because it was thought desirable that, seeing they were then under Persian rule, what plainly referred to Persia should be made conspicuous; the portion directed against the Babylonians was then placed immediately after that referring to Egypt; that referring to the Philistines was then put in its place, but that referring to Edom, as being longer, was inserted after it; then the three small pieces on Ammon, Kedar, and Damascus were put together, while the large one about Meab concluded this much-distorted series.” But the assertion of Movers and Hitzig

When we examine the contents of these nine oracles, we find that the one against Babylon differs from all the preceding in this, that it announces not merely the ruin of Babylon, but also the salvation of Israel; but this peculiarity is the very point in which it agrees with the prophecies against Egypt, of which the second ends with a promise in Israel's favour (xlvi. 27, 28). This correspondence shows us that we cannot separate the prophecy regarding Babylon from the others, or even place it in contrast with them. Egypt and Babylon were, at that time, the two great powers of this world which sought to oppress and destroy the kingdom of God. The fall of one or the other of these powers was thus for Israel a pledge that they would be preserved and saved. In the remaining oracles, the reference to the theocracy is quite placed in the background. Only in that against Ammon do we meet with the complaint that it had taken possession of the cities of Israel, as if Israel had no heir (xlix. 1). In the others there is no mention made of offence against the theocracy, but only of pride, arrogance, and carnal reliance on their earthly power, for which they shall be humbled and punished. Further, it is to be observed that the oracles against Egypt, Moab, Ammon, and Elam conclude with the promise of restoration at the end of the days, *i.e.* in the Messianic future (cf. xlvi. 26, xlviii. 47, xlix. 6 and 39). All these things plainly show that these oracles against the people merely repeat, in greater detail, the sentence already pronounced, chap. xxv., against all nations: God the Lord has appointed the king of Babylon to execute this sentence, and for this end will give him, in the immediate future, and till his appointed time shall end, supremacy over the nations; after that, Babylon also shall

—that this arrangement in the Greek text did not originate with the translator, but was found in the original, and that, too (according to Movers), at the time of Alexander's campaign against Persia—rests on critical conjectures regarding chap. xlvi. 27, 28, which are decidedly erroneous. Moreover, the insertion of these oracles into the middle of chap. xxv., between vers. 13 and 15, in the LXX. text, is due to the arbitrary conduct of the Alexandrine translator, as even Hitzig allows that whoever arranged the chapter did not find it in a fragmentary condition, but had himself dismembered it. Yet Hitzig is of opinion that these oracles originally belonged to somewhere about chap. xxv.,—a view that rests on grounds which, in the note on p. 376 ff. of vol. i., we have already shown to be untenable.

succumb to the sentence of ruin passed on it; and for Israel, with the deliverance from Babylon, there will arise a state of prosperity in which all nations will afterwards participate. In giving details with regard to these announcements of judgment, Jeremiah throughout falls back on the expressions of the older prophets, just as he does in his prophecies regarding Israel and Judah; these expressions he reproduces in a manner suited to the circumstances of his time, and still further develops. Cf. the collection of these references in Kueper on Jeremiah, p. 79 ff.; see further the proofs given in the following commentary on each particular case.

Chap. xlvi. *On Egypt.*

Vers. 1 and 2. *Superscriptions.*—Ver. 1 contains the title for the whole collection of prophecies regarding the nations (הַגָּויִם, as contrasted with Israel, mean the heathen nations), chap. xlvi.-li. As to the formula, “What came as the word of Jalivel to Jeremiah,” etc., cf. the remarks on xiv. 1.—In ver. 2, the special heading of this chapter begins with the word לִמְצָרִים. מְצָרִים is subordinated by לְ to the general title,—properly, “with regard to Egypt:” cf. לְמֹאָב, etc., xlvi. 1, xlii. 1, 7, 23, 28, also xxiii. 9. This chapter contains two prophecies regarding Egypt, vers. 2-12, and vers. 13-28. לִמְצָרִים refers to both. After this there follows an account of the occasion for the first of these two prophecies, in the words, “Concerning the army of Pharaoh-Necho, the king of Egypt, which was at the river Euphrates, near Carchemish, which Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah king of Judah.” נֶכֶם, as in 2 Chron. xxxv. 20, or נֶכֶה, as in 2 Kings xxiii. 29, in LXX. *Nēχāw*; Egyptian, according to Brugsch (*Hist. d'Egypte*, i. p. 252), *Nekāou*; in Herodotus *Nekōs*,—is said by Manetho to have been the sixth king of the twenty-sixth (Saïte) dynasty, the second Pharaoh of this name, the son of Psammetichus I., and grandson of Necho I. Brugsch says he reigned from 611 to 595 B.C. See on 2 Chron. xxiii. 29. The two relative clauses are co-ordinate, *i.e.* אֲשֶׁר in each case depends on לִי. The first clause merely states where Pharaoh's army was, the second tells what befell it at the Euphrates. It is to this that the following prophecy refers.

Pharaoh-Necho, soon after ascending the throne, in the last year of Josiah's reign (610 B.C.), had landed in Palestine, at the bay of Acre, with the view of subjugating Hither Asia as far as the Euphrates, and had defeated and slain King Josiah, who marched out against him. He next deposed Jehoahaz, whom the people had raised to the throne as Josiah's successor, and carried him to Egypt, after having substituted Eliakim, the elder brother of Jehoahaz, and made him his vassal-king, under the name of Jehoiakim. When he had thus laid Judah under tribute, he advanced farther into Syria, towards the Euphrates, and had reached Carchemish on that river, as is stated in this verse: there his army was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim (606 B.C.); see on 2 Kings xxiii. 29 f. *Carchemish* is *Καρκήσιον*, *Circesium*, or *Cer-*

cusium of the classical writers,¹ Arabic قَرْقِيسِيَّةٌ, a fortified city at the junction of the Chebar with the Euphrates, built on the peninsula formed by the two rivers (Ammian. Marc. xxiii. 5, Procop. *bell. Pers.* ii. 5, and Marasç. under *Karkesija*). All that now remains of it are ruins, called by the modern Arabs *Abu Psara*, and situated on the Mesopotamian side of the Euphrates, where that river is joined by the Chebar (Ausland, 1864, S. 1058). This fortress was either taken, or at least besieged, by Necho. The statement, "in the fourth year of Jehoiakim," can be referred exegetically only to the time of the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish, or the year of the battle, and is actually so understood by most interpreters. No one but Niebuhr (*Gesch. Ass. u. Bab.* S. 59, 86, 370 ff.) alters the date of the battle, which he places in the third year of Jehoiakim, partly from consideration of Dan. i. 1, partly from other chronological calculations; he would refer the date given in our verse to the time when the following song was composed or published. But Dan. i. 1 does not necessarily require us to make any such assumption (see on that passage), and the other chronological computations are quite uncertain. Exegetically, it is as impossible to insert a period after "which Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon smote" (Nieg. p. 86, note 3), as to

¹ See the opinion of Rawlinson in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, vol. i. p. 278.
—TR.

connect the date "in the fourth year of Jehoiakim" with "which word came to Jeremiah" (ver. 1). The title in ver. 1 certainly does not refer specially to the prophecy about Egypt, but to **עַל־הַפּוּנִים**. But if we wished to make the whole of ver. 2 dependent on **אַנְשֵׁר הַיְהּוּדָה דָּבָר וּנְ**, which would, at all events, be a forced, unnatural construction, then, from the combination of the title in ver. 1 with the specification of time at the end of ver. 2, it would follow that all the prophecies regarding the nations had come to Jeremiah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, —which would contradict what is said in the heading to the oracle against Elam (xlix. 34), not to mention the oracle against Babylon. Moreover, there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that the first prophecy against Egypt was revealed to Jeremiah, and uttered by him, in the same fourth year of Jehoiakim in which Necho was defeated by Nebuchadnezzar. In this way, the argument brought forward by Niebuhr in support of his forced interpretation, viz. that all specifications of time in the addresses of Jeremiah refer to the period of composition, loses all its force. In xlvi. 1 also, and in li. 9, the time when the event occurred coincides with the time when the utterance regarding it was pronounced. Although we assume this to hold in the case before us, yet it by no means follows that what succeeds, in vers. 3–12, is not a prophecy, but a song or lyric celebrating so important a battle, "the picture of an event that had already occurred," as Niebuhr, Ewald, and Hitzig assume. This neither follows from the statement in the title, "which Nebuchadnezzar in the fourth year of Jehoiakim smote," nor from the contents of the succeeding address. The superscription does not naturally belong to what Jeremiah has said or uttered, but must have been prefixed, for the first time, only when the address was committed to writing and inserted in the collection, and this not till after the battle had been fought; but it is evident that the address is to be viewed as substantially a prophecy (see vers. 6b and 10b), although Jeremiah depicts, in the most lively and dramatic way, not merely the preparation of the mighty host, ver. 3, and its formidable advance, vers. 7–9, but also its flight and annihilation, in ver. 5 and vers. 10–12.

Ver. 3. "Prepare shield and target, and advance to the battle. Ver. 4. Yoke the horses [to the chariots]; mount the

steeds, and stand with helmets on ; polish the spears, put on the armour. Ver. 5. Why do I see ? they are terrified and turned back, and their heroes are beaten, and flee in flight, and do not turn : terror is round about, saith Jahveh. Ver. 6. Let not the swift one flee, nor let the hero escape ; towards the north, by the side of the river Euphrates, they stumble and fall. Ver. 7. Who is this that cometh up like the Nile ? his waters wave like the rivers. Ver. 8. Egypt cometh up like the Nile, [his] waters are moved like the rivers ; and he saith, I will go up, I will cover the earth ; I will destroy the city, and those who dwell in it. Ver. 9. Go up, ye horses ; and drive furiously, ye chariots ; and let the heroes go forth ; Cushites and Phutites, bearing the shield ; and Lydians, handling [and] bending the bow. Ver. 10. But that day [belongs] to the Lord Jahveh of hosts, a day of vengeance for avenging Himself on His enemies : and the sword shall devour and be satisfied, and shall drink its fill of their blood ; for the Lord Jahveh of hosts holdeth a slaying of sacrifices in the land of the north at the river Euphrates. Ver. 11. Go up to Gilead, and take balsam, O virgin, daughter of Egypt : in vain hast thou multiplied medicines ; cure there is none for thee. Ver. 12. The nations have heard of thine ignominy, and thy cry hath filled the earth : for heroes stumble against heroes, both of them fall together."

This address falls into two strophes, vers. 3-6 and 7-12. In both are depicted in a lively manner, first the advance of the Egyptian host to the battle, then their flight and destruction. The whole has been arranged so as to form a climax : in the first strophe, the admirable equipment of the armies, and their sudden flight and defeat, are set forth in brief sentences ; in the second, there is fully described not merely the powerful advance of the host that covers the earth, but also the judgment of inevitable destruction passed on them by God : the reason for the whole is also assigned. Ver. 3 f. In order to represent the matter in a lively way, the description begins with the call addressed to the army, to make ready for the battle. "Make ready shield and target," the two main pieces of defensive armour. **מַפְלָגָה** was the small [round] shield ; **מַפְלָגָה**, *scutum*, the large shield, covering the whole body. "Advance to the fight," i.e. go for-

ward into the battle. Then the address turns to the several portions of the army: first to those who fight from chariots, who are to yoke the horses; then to the horsemen, to mount the steeds. פְּרִשִׁים are not horsemen, but riding-horses, as in 1 Kings v. 6, x. 26, Ezek. xxvii. 14. עֲלָה is construed with the accus., as in Gen. xl ix. 4. The rendering given by Dahler and Umbreit, "Mount, ye horsemen," and that of Hitzig, "Advance, ye horsemen," are against the parallelism; and the remark of the last-named writer, that "Mount the steeds" would be רְכֻבֵּי, does not accord with 1 Sam. xxx. 17. Next, the address is directed to the foot-soldiers, who formed the main portion of the army. These are to take up their position with helmets on, to polish the spears, *i.e.* to sharpen them, and to put on the pieces of armour, in order to be arrayed for battle. מִינָק, to rub, polish, remove rust from the spear, and thereby sharpen it. בְּרִזּוֹן, here and in li. 3 for שְׂרִירָן, a coat of mail, pieces of armour.—Vers. 5, 6. Thus well arrayed, the host advances to the fight; but suddenly the seer perceives the magnificent army terror-stricken, retreating, and breaking out into a disorderly flight. The question, "Why (wherefore) do I see?" points to the unexpected and incomprehensible turn in the progress of events. חַתָּה חַתִּים is not an accus. dependent on בְּאִתִּי, but an independent clause: "What do I see? They are terror-stricken" (חַתִּים, terrified, broken-spirited through terror). בַּתָּה, Hoph. from בַּתָּה, to be broken, here and in Job iv. 20 applied to persons. מִינָס is added to the verb instead of the inf. abs., to give emphasis to the idea contained in the word; cf. Ewald, § 281, *a*. מִנּוֹר מִפְּכַבֵּב, "horror, terror around" (cf. vi. 25), is taken by Ewald as the reply of Jahveh to the question, "Wherefore is this? On every side there is danger;" and this is appropriately followed by the imperatives in ver. 6, "Let no one, then, attempt to flee; not one shall escape to Egypt, but they must fall at the Euphrates." The perfects בְּשָׁלֹו וְנָפְלוּ are prophetic; the stumbling and falling are as certain as if they had already happened. The second strophe commences at ver. 7. The description begins anew, and that with a question of astonishment at the mighty host advancing like the Nile when it bursts its banks and inundates the whole country. יָאָר is the name of the Nile, taken from

the Egyptian into the Hebrew language ; cf. Gen. xli. ff., Ex. i. 22, etc. **הַתְּעַשׂ**, dash about (v. 22), wave backwards and forwards : the Hithpa. is here interchanged with the Hithpo. without any difference of meaning.—Ver. 8 brings the answer to the question of astonishment : “ Egypt approaches, its hosts cover the land like the waves of the Nile, to destroy cities and men.” On the form **אָבִקְרָה** (with **בְּ** contracted from **בְּנָ**), cf. Ewald, § 192, *d*; Gesenius, § 68, Rem. 1. **עִיר** is used in an indefinite general sense, “ cities,” as in viii. 16.—In ver. 9, the imperat. stands as in ver. 3 f. : “ Let the formidable army approach,—cavalry, chariots, and infantry, with all their splendidly equipped auxiliaries,—nevertheless it shall perish.” **עַל** **הַסּוּסִים** does not here mean “ Mount the steeds,” which is against the parallelism, but “ Get up (*i.e.* prance), ye horses ;” this meaning is guaranteed by the Hiphil **מַעֲלָה**, as used in Nah. iii. 3. **הַתְּהִלֵּל** **חֲרָכָב** is an imitation of Nah. ii. 5. As auxiliaries, and very braves one too (**גְּבוּרִים**), are mentioned “ Cush,” *i.e.* the Ethiopians ; “ Phut,” the Libyans ; and “ Ludim,” *i.e.* Hamitic, African Lydians, as in Ezek. xxx. 5. On the double construct in **תִּפְנִישׁ** **דְּרִיכִי** **קָשָׁת**, “ holding, bending bows,” cf. Ew. § 280, *c*.—Ver. 10. This formidable army shall perish ; for the day of the battle is the day of the Lord of hosts, on which He will take vengeance upon His enemies. Among these enemies are the Egyptians, who have grievously sinned against Israel, the people of the Lord, not merely of late, by making war upon and killing King Josiah, by carrying away Jehoahaz, and making Jehoiakim his vassal, but also from the earliest times. For this, Egypt is now to be brought low. The sword shall devour and be refreshed by drinking the blood of the Egyptians. For the Lord is preparing for a slaying of sacrifices (**יִבְחַ**) in the north, at the Euphrates. Isa. xxxiv. 6 forms the basis of these words.—Ver. 11. The blow which shall there come on the Egyptians is one from which they shall never recover, and the wound shall be one not to be healed by any balm. As to the balm of Gilead, see on viii. 22 ; on **רְפָאֹת** and **תַּעֲלָה**, see xxx. 13. “ Virgin daughter of Egypt ” is equivalent to virgin-like people of Egypt, *i.e.* not hitherto forced, but now ravished, violated, so that all nations shall hear of the dishonour done them, and their cry shall fill the whole earth, for (as at the conclusion,

the threat is added by way of confirmation) all the heroes of Egypt stumble and fall. בָּגָבָר בָּגָבָר, “hero against hero,” i.e. one against another, or over the others, as usually happens in a flight where confusion reigns; cf. Jer. xxvi. 37.

Vers. 13-28. *The second prophecy regarding Egypt, with a message for Israel attached to it*, was uttered after the preceding. This is evident even from the superscription, ver. 13: “The word which Jahveh spake to Jeremiah the prophet of the coming of Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon to smite the land of Egypt.” The formula, “The word which,” etc., agrees with that in l. 1; and בָּגָר, in contrast with הַנִּיחָה, the word usually met with in headings, perhaps means that this prophecy, like that concerning Babylon, was not uttered in public by Jeremiah, but only written down. לְבָזָא is used in reference to the coming of Nebuchadrezzar to smite the land. Graf puts down this heading as an addition, not made till a late edition of the prophecies was brought out, and even then added through a mistake on the part of the compiler. In support of this, he urges that the announcement in vers. 14-26 does not form an independent prophecy, but merely constitutes the second portion of the description given in vers. 3-12 of the defeat of the Egyptians. But the ground assigned for this view, viz. that if this prophecy formed a separate and distinct piece, written at another time, then Jeremiah would have predicted the conquest of the other countries, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, etc., in consequence of the battle of Carchemish; and as regards Egypt, would have contented himself with a triumphal song over its fall—which is in itself unlikely: this argument is utterly null. It has no meaning whatever; for vers. 3-12 contain, not a triumphal song over a defeat that had already taken place, but a prophecy regarding the defeat about to take place. To this the prophet added a second prophecy, in which he once more announces beforehand to Egypt that it shall be conquered. In this way, more is foretold regarding Egypt than the neighbouring countries, because Egypt was of much greater consequence, in relation to the theocracy, than Philistia, Moab, etc. According to the superscription, this second prophecy refers to the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. According to xxxvii. 5, this did not

take place so long as Zedekiah was king; and according to xlivi. 8 ff., it was foretold by Jeremiah, after the destruction of Jerusalem, when the Jews were fleeing to Egypt after the murder of Gedaliah. From this, one might conclude, with Nägelsbach, that the piece now before us is contemporaneous with xlivi. 8 ff. But this inference is not a valid one. The threat uttered in xlivi. 8 ff. of a conquest to befall Egypt had a special occasion of its own, and we cannot well regard it in any other light than as a repetition of the prophecy now before us, for the Jews; for its contents seem to show that it was composed not long after that in vers. 3-12, or soon after the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish. This address also falls into two strophes, vers. 14-19 and vers. 20-26, while vers. 27, 28 form an additional message for Israel. The line of thought is this: Egypt may arm herself as she chooses, but her power shall fall, and her auxiliaries shall flee (vers. 14-16). Pharaoh's fall is certain; the enemy shall come in force, and turn all Egypt into a desert (vers. 17-19). The destroyer comes from the north, the mercenaries flee, and the enemy hews down countless hosts of men like trees in a forest (vers. 20-23). Egypt will be given into the hand of the people out of the north; for Jahveh will punish gods, princes, and people, and deliver up Egypt to the king of Babylon. But afterwards, Egypt will again be inhabited as it was before (vers. 24-26). On the other hand, Israel need fear nothing, for their God will lead them back out of their captivity (vers. 27, 28).

Ver. 14. "Tell ye it in Egypt, and make it to be heard in Migdol, and make it be heard in Noph and Tahpanhes: say, Stand firm, and prepare thee; for the sword hath devoured around thee. Ver. 15. Why hath thy strong one been swept away? he stood not, for Jahveh pushed him down. Ver. 16. He made many stumble, yea, one fell on another; and they said, Arise, and let us return to our own people, and to the land of our birth, from before the oppressing sword. Ver. 17. They cried there, Pharaoh the king of Egypt is undone; he hath let the appointed time pass. Ver. 18. As I live, saith the King, whose name is Jahveh of hosts, Surely as Tabor among the mountains, and as Carmel by the sea, shall he come. Ver. 19. Prepare thee things for exile, O daughter dwelling in

Egypt: for Noph will become a desolation, and be destroyed by fire, without an inhabitant."

Like the last prophecy, this one also begins with the summons to arms (ver. 14), in order to prepare the way for the description given immediately afterwards of the defeat (ver. 15 ff.). The summons to make the proclamation is addressed to some persons not named, who are to announce through the country, particularly in the frontier towns and in the northern capital of Egypt, that the foe, in his devastating career, has advanced to the borders of the land. This is evident from the clause which states the reason: "The sword hath devoured what lay round thee." Regarding Migdol, *i.e.* *Magdolos*, and Tahpanhes, *i.e.* *Daphne*, the two frontier towns in the north, and Noph, *i.e.* *Memphis*, the northern capital of the kingdom, see on ii. 16 and xliv. 1. **הַחֲזָקָה**, to take up one's position for the fight; cf. ver. 4. **סֻבִּירָה**, "thy surroundings," are the frontier countries, but especially those on the north,—Judah, Philistia, Edom,—since the enemy comes from the north. However, we cannot with certainty infer from this, that by that time the kingdom of Judah had already fallen, and Jerusalem been laid waste. Immediately after Necho had been vanquished at the Euphrates, Nebuchadnezzar marched after the fugitive foe, pursuing him as far as the borders of Egypt; hence we read, in 2 Kings xxiv. 7, "The king of Egypt went no more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken all that had belonged to the king of Egypt, from the river of Egypt to the river Euphrates." Even at that time, in the fourth and fifth years of Jehoiakim, it could be said, "His sword hath devoured the countries contiguous to Egypt." And Nebuchadnezzar was prevented on that occasion from advancing farther, and penetrating into Egypt itself, only by hearing of his father's death at Babylon, in consequence of which he was compelled to return to Babylon as speedily as possible, for the purpose of assuming the reins of government, and to let his army with the prisoners follow him at their leisure (Bero-sus in Josephus, *contra Ap.* i. 19).—Ver. 15. The prophet in spirit looks on the power of Egypt as already broken. This is shown by the question of astonishment, **מַהֲעַ נִסְתַּחַפְתִּי אֲבִירִיךְ**, which has been variously rendered. "אֲבִירִים," "strong ones," is

used in Jer. viii. 16, xlvi. 3, and l. 11, of stallions, but elsewhere as an epithet of bulls, especially the strong bulls of Bashan; see on viii. 16. In the present passage the reference may be to the mighty men of war, who do not maintain their position (Chald. and most of the old interpreters); the verb in the singular forms no sufficient objection to this view, the irregularity being due to the fact that the verb precedes its subject [see Ewald, § 316, *t*; Gesenius, § 147]. It is more difficult to combine with this the singulars of the verbs עָמַד and הָדַבֵּר which follow; these, and especially the suffix in the singular, appear to indicate that אֲבִירִיךְ really refers to a noun in the singular. But the form of this noun seems against such a view; for the words adduced in support of the position that singular nouns sometimes assume plural suffixes, are insufficient for the purpose: thus, תְּהִלְתִּיךְ, Ps. ix. 15, and שְׁנָאתִיךְ, Ezek. xxxv. 11, are plainly nouns in the singular. And in support of the averment that, in pausal forms with Segol, the ' is a mere *matcr lectionis*, only בְּנִיךְ, Prov. vi. 1, can be adduced: the other instances brought forward by Hitzig fail to establish his position. For אֲבִיךְ, Deut. xxviii. 48, may be plural; בְּנִי, Gen. xvi. 5, is far from being a case in point, for the preposition often takes plural suffixes; and even in the case of הַסִּידִיךְ, Ps. xvi. 10, the ' is marked in the *Qeri* as superfluous; most codices, too, rather give the form חַסִּידִיךְ. But even in the verse now before us, many codices, according to Kennicott and de Rossi, read אֲבִיךְ, so that the word should perhaps be taken as a singular. The singulars, however, which occur in the following clauses do not form conclusive proofs of this, since they may be taken in a distributive sense; and more generally the address often suddenly changes from the plural to the singular. In connection with the possibility of taking אֲבִירִיךְ as a singular, the paraphrase of the LXX. deserves mention and consideration, ὁ μόσχος ὁ ἐκλεκτός σου, to which a gloss adds ὁ Ἄπις. But we cannot agree with Kennicott, J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Hitzig, Graf, and Nügelsbach, in holding this as certainly the correct rendering; nor can we give to אֲבִירִיךְ the sense of "bull," for this meaning is not made out for the singular simply because the plural is used of strong bulls: this holds especially in Jeremiah, who constantly applies the plural

to strong steeds. Still less ground is there for appealing to the fact that Jahveh is repeatedly called אָבִיר יִשְׂרָאֵל or אָבִיר עֲזָבָב, Gen. xl ix. 24, Isa. i. 24, xl ix. 26, etc.; for this epithet of Jahveh (who shows Himself in or towards Israel as the Mighty One) cannot be applied to the helpless images of Apis. In Ps. lxviii. 31, אֲבִירִים means “strong ones”—bulls as emblems of kings. If the word be used here with such a reference, it may be singular or plural. In the former case it would mean the king; in the latter, the king with his princes and magnates. Against the application of the word to the images of Apis, there is the fact that Apis, a symbol of Osiris, was neither the only nor the chief god of Egypt, but was worshipped nowhere except in Memphis (Herodotus, ii. 153); hence it was not suited to be the representative of the gods or the power of Egypt, as the context of the present passage requires.—Ver. 16. As the mighty one of Egypt does not stand, but is thrust down by God, so Jahveh makes many stumble and fall over one another, so that the strangers return to their own home in order to escape the violence of the sword. The subject of וְאִמְרָג is indefinite; the speakers, however, are not merely the hired soldiers or mercenaries (ver. 11), or the allied nations (Ezek. xxx. 5), but strangers generally, who had been living in Egypt partly for the sake of commerce, partly for other reasons (Hitzig, Graf). As to חַרְבַּת יִזְנָה, see on xxv. 38.—In ver. 17, “they cry there” is not to be referred to those who fled to their native land; the subject is undefined, and “there” refers to the place where one falls over the other, viz. Egypt. “There they cry, ‘Pharaoh the king of Egypt is נָשָׁשׁ, desolation, destruction, ruin :’” for this meaning, cf. xxv. 31, Ps. xl. 3; the signification “noise, bustle,” is unsuitable here.¹

¹ The word מָשׁ has been read by the LXX. and the Vulgate as if it had been מָשָׁשׁ, ὄνομα, nomen; accordingly the LXX. render, οὐλέσατε τὸ ὄνομα Φαραὼ Νεκρᾶ, βασίλεως Αἰγύπτου, Σαῶν Ἐσβεῖ Ἐμωῆδο (or Ἐσβεῖ Μωῆδο); Vulgate, vocate nomen Pharaonis regis Αἴγυπτι: Tumultum adduxit tempus. This reading is preferred by J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf, with this difference, that Hitzig and Graf take only מָשׁ as a name. Hence Ewald translates, “They call Pharaoh’s name ‘Noisc-which-a-wink-can-hush.’” This rendering is decidedly false, for מָשׁ nowhere has the sense of “wink, nod,” not even in Judg. xx. 38, where it means an agreement

The meaning of the Hebrew **הַמּוֹעֵד** also is disputed; it is quite inadmissible, however, to join the words with **שָׁאֹן**, as Ewald does, for the purpose of making out a name. No suitable meaning can be extracted from them. Neither **שָׁאֹן** nor **הַמּוֹעֵד** can be the subject of **הַעֲבִיר**; the translation given by Schnurrer, “devastation that goes beyond all bounds,” is still more arbitrary than that of Ewald given in the note. Since the Hiphil **הַעֲבִיר** is never used except with a transitive meaning, the subject can be none else than Pharaoh; and the words **הַעֲבִיר** **הַמּוֹעֵד** must be intended to give the reason for his becoming a desolation: they are thus to be rendered, “he has allowed **הַמּוֹעֵד** to pass by,” not “the precise place,” as Rosenmüller explains it (“he did not stop in his flight at the place where the army could be gathered again, on the return”), but “the precise time.” The reference, however, is not to the suitable time for action, for self-defence and for driving off the enemy (Grotius, C. B. Michaelis, Maurer, Umbreit), because the word does not mean suitable, convenient time, but appointed time. As Hitzig rightly perceived, the time meant is that within which the desolation might still be averted, and after which the judgment of God fell on him (Isa. x. 25, xxx. 18),—the time of grace which God had vouchsafed to him, so that Nebuchadnezzar did not at once, after the victory at Carchemish, invade and conquer Egypt. Pharaoh let this time pass by; because, instead of seeing in that defeat a judgment from God, he provoked the anger of Nebuchadnezzar by his repeated attacks on the Chaldean power, and brought on the invasion of Egypt by the king of Babylon (see above, p. 155).

made. For the reading **שָׁמַן** instead of **שָׁמַן** there are no sufficient grounds, although such passages as xx. 3 and Isa. xxx. 7 may be adduced in support of the idea obtained by such a change in the word. The translation of the LXX. is merely a reproduction of the Hebrew words by Greek letters, and shows that the translator did not know how to interpret them. The Vulgate rendering, *tumultum adduxit tempus*, is also devoid of meaning. Moreover, these translators have read **קְרָאֵן** as the imperative **קְרָאֵ**; if we reject this reading, as all moderns do, then we may also lay no weight on **שָׁמַן** instead of **שָׁמַן**. Besides, the meaning is not materially affected by this reading, for the giving of a name to a person merely expresses what he is or will be.

—In ver. 18 f. there is laid down a more positive foundation for the threat uttered in ver. 17. With an oath, the Lord announces the coming of the destroyer into Egypt. Like Tabor, which overtops all the mountains round about, and like Carmel, which looks out over the sea as if it were a watch-tower, so will he come, viz. he from whom proceeds the devastation of Egypt, the king of Babylon. The power of Nebuchadnezzar, in respect of its overshadowing all other kings, forms the point of comparison. Tabor has the form of a truncated cone. Its height is given at 1805 feet above the level of the sea, or 1350 from the surface of the plain below; it far surpasses in height all the hills in the vicinity, and affords a wide prospect on every side; cf. Robinson's *Phys. Geogr. of Palestine*, p. 26 f. Carmel stretches out in the form of a long ridge more than three miles wide, till it terminates on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea, as a bold, lofty promontory, which rises in an imposing manner at least 500 feet above the sea; cf. Robinson, p. 26 f. Then the inhabitants of Egypt will be driven into exile. פְּלִי נֹלֶה, “vessels of wandering;” outfit for an exile, as in Ezek. xii. 3. “Daughter of Egypt” is not a personification of the country, whose inhabitants are the people, but of the population, which is viewed as the daughter of the country; it stands in apposition to יְשֻׁבָת, like בְּחִילָה בְּתַ מִצְרָיִם, ver. 11. For Noph, *i.e.* Memphis, the capital, is laid waste and burned, so as to lose its inhabitants. With ver. 20 begins the second strophe, in which the fate impending on Egypt is still more plainly predicted.

Ver. 20. “Egypt is a very beautiful young heifer; a gadfly from the north comes—comes. Ver. 21. Her mercenaries, too, in her midst, are like fatted calves; for they also turn their backs, they flee together: they do not stand, for the day of her destruction is come on her, the time of her visitation. Ver. 22. Its sound is like [that of] the serpent [as it] goes; for they go with an army, and come against her with axes, like hewers of trees. Ver. 23. They cut down her forest, saith Jahveh, for it is not to be searched; for they are more numerous than locusts, and they cannot be numbered. Ver. 24. The daughter of Egypt is disgraced; she is given into the hand of the people of the north. Ver. 25. Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel, saith, Behold, I will visit Amon of No, and Pharaoh, and Egypt, her gods, and

her kings ; Pharaoh, and all those who trust in him. Ver. 26. And I will give them into the hand of those who seek their life, even into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon, and into the hand of his servants ; but afterwards it shall be inhabited, as in the days of old, saith Jahveh."

In ver. 20 the address begins afresh, in order to carry out further, under new images, the description of the desolation already threatened. Egypt is a very beautiful עֲמָלֵה ; this feminine is chosen with a regard to "the daughter of Egypt." יְפָחֵת is an adjective formed from the Peal of יָפַח, "very beautiful," not "coquetting" (Hitzig, who follows the κεκαλλωπισμένη of the LXX.). A very beautiful heifer is the people when carefully and abundantly fed in their beautiful and fertile land (Hitzig). Upon this heifer there comes from the north קָרֵךְ. This ἄπ. λεγ. is variously rendered. קָרֵךְ means, in the Hebrew, to pinch, nip (Job xxxiii. 6), to compress together, as in winking (Ps. xxxv. 19), to bring the lips closely together (Prov. xvi. 30), and to nip off; cf. قَرْصٌ to pinch, nip, cut off. Hence A. Schultens (*Orig. Heb.* ii. 34 sqq.), after Cocceius, and with a reference to Virgil, *Georg.* iii. 147, has rendered קָרֵךְ by *morsus vellicans oestri*. Hitzig (with whom Roediger, in his additions to Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, agrees) takes قَارِصٌ *insectum cimici simile* as his warrant for rendering it by *oestrus*, "the gadfly," which gives a more suitable meaning. Ewald, on the contrary, compares קָרֵךְ with قَرْشٌ, and translates it "whale," a huge sea-monster ; but this is quite arbitrary, for קָרֵךְ does not correspond to the Arabic قَرْشٌ, and the whale or shark does not afford any figure that would be suitable for the context: *e.g.* ver. 21, "her mercenaries *also* flee," shows that the subject treated of is not the devouring or destruction, but the expulsion of the Egyptians out of their land ; this is put as an addition to what is said about exile in ver. 19. Still less suitable is the general rendering *excidium*, destruction (Rabbins, Gesenius, Umbreit) ; and there is no lexical foundation for the Vulgate translation *stimulator*, nor for "taskmaster," the rendering of J. D. Michaelis and Rosenmüller. The old translators

have only made guesses from the context. The figure of the gadfly corresponds to the bee in the land of Assyria, Isa. vii. 18. The repetition of נָא gives emphasis, and points either to the certainty of the coming, or its continuance.—Ver. 21. The mercenaries, also, of the daughter of Egypt, well fed, like fatted calves, betake themselves to flight. שִׁבְרִים are “mercenaries,” as distinguished from the allies mentioned in ver. 9. It was Carians and Ionians through whom Psammetichus attained the supremacy over all Egypt: these had settled down in *στρατόπεδα* of their own, between Bubastis and Pelusium, on both banks of the eastern arm of the Nile (Herodotus, ii. 152, 154), and were very well cared for, since the king relied on them (Herod. ii. 152, 163). Hence the comparison with fatted calves, which, moreover, are co-ordinated with the subject, as is shown by the resumption of the subject in בְּם הַתָּה. יְיָ stands in the middle of the sentence, with an asseverative meaning: “Yea, these also turn their back, they flee together, do not stand; for the day of their destruction is come.” “The day of their destruction” is used as in xviii. 17. On “the time of their visitation” (which stands in apposition to the preceding expression), cf. xi. 23, xxiii. 12: it is not an accusative of time (Graf), for this always expresses the idea of continuance during a space of time. In vers. 22, 23, the annihilation of the power of Egypt is portrayed under another figure. A difficult expression is קָרְךָ בְּנֵחֶשׁ יְלֵךְ, “her (viz. that of the daughter of Egypt) voice is like (the voice of) the serpent (which) goes.” יְלֵךְ must be taken as part of a relative sentence, since this verb is nowhere used of a voice or sound; hence it cannot be so joined here. Ewald, following the *συρίζοντος* of the LXX., would read קָרְשׁ, “hissing,” instead of יְלֵךְ, and translates, “it makes a noise like the hissing serpent.” He more fully defines the meaning thus: “Even though Egypt were hidden like a serpent in a thicket, yet it would be heard in its flight, like a nasty serpent hissing fiercely, while it hurries away from the axe of the wood-cutter.” But, apart from the arbitrary change of יְלֵךְ into קָרְשׁ (the former word is used in Gen. iii. 14 of the going, i.e. crawling, of a serpent), Ewald puts into the words an idea altogether foreign to them. The nasty, fierce hissing of the serpent that is forced to flee, is quite unsuitable; for there is no further

mention made of the flight of the Egyptians, but Egypt is hewn down like a forest by woodcutters. Moreover, as Graf has already well remarked, Egypt is not compared to a serpent, but only its voice to the voice or hiss of a serpent. For **חִזְקָר** signifies, not merely the voice, but any sound, even the rustling and rattling of leaves (cf. Gen. iii. 8, Lev. xxvi. 36, 2 Sam. v. 24); hence it may denote the noise caused by a serpent crawling on its belly in the thicket. The comparison, as Graf has correctly observed, is like that in Isa. xxix. 4. There it is the daughter of Zion, but here it is the daughter of Egypt that lies on the ground, deeply humbled; weeping softly and moaning, making a sound like that of a serpent in a moss among fallen leaves, fleeing before the woodcutters.¹ Thus she lies on the ground, for the enemy comes in force, with axes like woodcutters, to hew down the forest of men in Egypt. The mention of the axes is occasioned by the comparison of the foe to woodcutters; we are not to think of battle-axes as weapons of the Massagetae, Scythians, Persians, and other nations (Herodotus, i. 215, iv. 70, vii. 64; Xenophon, *Cyroped.* i. 2, 9). Axes here form the type of murderous weapons generally. On the comparison of a multitude of people to a forest, cf. xxi. 14, Isa. x. 18 f., 33 f. The clause **כִּי לֹא יָחַקְרָה** is referred by L. de Dieu, J. D. Michaelis, Hitzig, Nügelsbach, etc., to the wood, “for it cannot be explored

¹ The old translators have quite misunderstood these words, and attempted to apply them, each one according to his own fancy, to the enemy. Thus the LXX. translate: Φωνὴ αὐτῶν (λόγοί) ὡς ὁφεσιν αυριζοντος, ὅτι ἐν ἀμυν (חִזְקָר for לְחִזְקָה) πορεύονται, κ.τ.λ. Chald. . vox collisionis armorum eorum est sicut vox serpentum repellentium; and similarly the Syriac. The Vulgate is: vox ejus quasi aeris (נָהָרָה for נָהָרָה) sonabit, quoniam cum exercitu properabunt et cum securibus venient. The translator of the Vulgate has thus read חִזְקָה, and referred the suffix to קָרָה, which he renders *stimulator* Luther follows the Vulgate: “Sie faren daher, das der Harnisch brasselt, und kommen mit Heeres Krafft.” Hitzig also seeks to change the text, after the LXX., turning חִזְקָה into לְחִזְקָה, and לְחִזְקָה into חִזְקָה. But this alteration disturbs the order of the sentence. Not only in vers. 20 and 21, but also in vers. 23, 24, the first clause always treats of Egypt, and what befalls her is only stated in the clauses which follow: so is it in ver. 22. Thus the alteration made affords a very trivial result, viz. that the enemy advancing on Egypt march through the very sandy desert between Gaza and Egypt, and make slow progress, like serpents, because they wade through the sand; so that they make their appearance suddenly and unexpectedly.

or penetrated ;" thus a road must be made in order to get through it. However, the question is not about the enemy going or marching through Egypt, but about the destruction of Egypt and her powers. Rosenmüller and Graf, with Raschi, are more correct in referring the clause to the hostile army, "for it cannot be investigated," *i.e.* it is impossible to learn the number of them. It is no great objection to this interpretation that the verb occurs in the singular: this must be retained as it is, since it is not the individual enemies that cannot be searched out, but it is the number of the whole army that cannot be reckoned. On the employment of **חַקְרָה** in the Niphal in connection with the impossibility of counting a multitude, cf. 1 Kings vii. 47, and the expression **לֹא חַקְרָה** in Job v. 9, ix. 10, xxxvi. 36. The clauses which follow, and conclude ver. 23, explain the thought further: "more numerous than grasshoppers," *i.e.* innumerable.

In ver. 24 f. the result of the overthrow of Egypt, which has hitherto been set forth in figurative language, is stated in words which describe the exact realities: Egypt will be given up to ignominy, delivered into the power of a people from the north, *i.e.* the Chaldeans. The Lord of hosts, the Almighty God of Israel, punishes it for its sins. He visits, *i.e.* punishes, *Amon* of *No*, the chief idol of Egypt; Pharaoh, and the land, with all its gods and its kings, and with Pharaoh, all those who place their trust in his power. Words are accumulated for the purpose of showing that the judgment will be one which shall befall the whole land, together with its gods, its rulers, and its inhabitants. First of all is mentioned *Amon* of *No*, as in Ezek. xxx. 14 f. **נוֹ** is an abbreviation of **נוֹמָן נָוָן**, *i.e.* dwelling of *Amon*, the sacred name of the royal city in Upper Egypt, famous in antiquity, which the Greeks called *Διός πόλις*, or *Θήβη*, or *Θήβαι*, it is supposed, after the vulgar Egyptian name *Tapet* or *Tape* (Throne or Seat); see on Nah. iii. 8. *Amon*—in Greek *Αμμοῦν* (Herodotus, ii. 42), *Αμοῦν* (Plutarch, *de Is.* chap. 9), *Αμῶν* (Jamblichus, *de myst.* 5, 8)—was a sun-god (*Amon-Râ*), probably a symbol of the sun as it appears in the spring, in the sign of the Ram; hence he was represented with rams' horns. By the Greeks he was compared to Jupiter, or Zeus, and named *Jupiter Ammon*. The chief seat of his

worship was Thebes, where he had a temple, with a numerous learned priesthood and a famous oracle (cf. Strabo, xvii. 1. 43; Justin. xi. 11), which Cambyses destroyed (Diodorus Siculus, *Fragm. Lib. x.*). Under the expression “kings of Egypt” we are not to include governors or vassal-kings, but all the kings who ever ruled Egypt; for in the judgment now falling on Egypt, all the kings it ever had, together with all its gods, are punished. In the last part of the verse the name of Pharaoh is once more given, for the purpose of attaching to it the words “and all who trust in him;” these are intended for the Jews who expected help from Egypt. The punishment consists in their being all given into the hand of their enemies, namely (! explic.) into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar and his servants. This defeat, however, is not to be the end of the Egyptian kingdom. The threat of judgment concludes, in ver. 26b, with a promise for the future. “Afterwards, it shall be inhabited, as in the days of yore.” בָּיִם is used in a neuter sense, as in xvii. 6, xxxiii. 16, etc. Since this verb also signifies to settle down, be encamped (Num. xxiv. 2), and to lie quiet, to rest, or keep oneself quiet, inactive (Judg. v. 17; Prov. vii. 11), Hitzig and Graf, with Kimchi, give the explanation: “because the power of Egypt shall be broken, it will keep quiet, and remain at home in its own country, instead of marching forth and fighting other nations, as it has lately begun again to do (ver. 7) after centuries of peace.” But although, in support of this view, we are pointed to Ezek. xxix. 13, where the restoration of Egypt is predicted, with the further remark, “it will be an abject kingdom,” yet this idea is not contained in the words of our verse. To render בָּיִם by “to keep quiet, be inactive,” does not suit the words “as in the days of old.” In former days, Egypt was neither inactive nor remained at home in peace in its own land. From the remotest antiquity, the Pharaohs made wars, and sought to enlarge their dominions by conquest. Add to this, that we must view the concluding portion of this prophecy in a manner analogous to the closing thought of the prophecies regarding Moab (xlviii. 47), Ammon (xlix. 6), and Elam (xlix. 39), where the turning of the captivity in the last times is given in prospect to these nations, and “afterwards,” in xlix. 6, alternates with “in the latter days” found in xlvi. 47

and xlix. 39. From this it follows that, in the verse now before us also, it is not the future in general, but the last time, *i.e.* the Messianic future, that is pointed out; hence פַּעַם does not express the peaceful condition of the land, but its being inhabited, in contrast with its depopulation in the immediate future, in consequence of its inhabitants being killed or carried away. On the fulfilment of this threatening, see p. 151 ff.

Vers. 27, 28. *A promise for Israel.*—Ver. 27. “But fear not thou, O my servant Jacob, nor be dismayed: for, behold, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be at rest and secure, and no one shall make him afraid. Ver. 28. Fear thou not, my servant Jacob, saith Jahveh, for I am with thee; for I will make complete destruction of all the nations whither I have driven thee, but of thee will I not make complete destruction: yet I will correct thee in a proper manner, and I will not leave thee wholly unpunished.” These verses certainly form no integral portion of the prophecy, but an epilogue; yet they are closely connected with the preceding, and are occasioned by the declaration in ver. 26, that the Lord, when He visits Pharaoh, shall also visit all those who trust in Him. This word, which is directed to Judah, might be understood to declare that it is Judah chiefly which will share the fate of Egypt. In order to prevent such a misconception, Jeremiah adds a word for Israel, which shows how the true Israel has another destiny to hope for. Their deliverer is Jahveh, their God, who certainly punishes them for their sins, gives them up to the power of the heathen, but will also gather them again after their dispersion, and then grant them uninterrupted prosperity. This promise of salvation at the close of the announcement of judgment on Egypt is similar to the promise of salvation for Israel inserted in the threat of judgment against Babylon, l. 4-7 and 19, 20, li. 5, 6, 10, 35, 36, 45, 46, 50; and this similarity furnishes a proof in behalf of the genuineness of the verse, which is denied by modern critics. For, although what Nägelsbach remarks is quite correct, viz. that the fall of the kingdom of Babylon, through its conquest by Cyrus, directly brought about the deliverance of Israel, while the same cannot be said regarding the conquest of Egypt, yet even Egypt had a much greater

importance, in relation to Judah, than the smaller neighbouring nations, against which the oracles in chap. xlvii.-xlix. are directed; hence there is no ground for the inference that, because there is nothing said in these three chapters of such a connection between Egypt and Israel, it did not really exist. But when Nägelsbach further asks, "How does this agree with the fact that Jeremiah, on other occasions, while in Egypt, utters only the strongest threats against the Israelites—chap. xlvi.-xlii.?"—there is the ready answer, that the expressions in chap. xlvi.-xlii. do not apply to the whole covenant people, but only to the rabble of Judah that was ripe for the sentence of destruction, that had fled to Egypt against the will of God. What Hitzig and Graf have further urged in another place against the genuineness of the verses now before us, is scarcely worth mention. The assertion that the verses do not accord with the time of the foregoing prophecy, and rather presuppose the exile, can have weight only with those who *à priori* deny that the prophet could make any prediction. But if Jeremiah, in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, distinctly announces not merely the carrying away of Judah to Babylon, but also fixes the duration of the exile at seventy years, then he might well speak at the same time, or later, of the restoration of Israel from their captivity.

But there are two other considerations which support the genuineness of these verses: (1) The fact that Hitzig and Graf are obliged to confess it remains a problem how they came to form a part of the oracle against Egypt. The attempt made by the former writer to solve this problem partly rests on the assumption, already refuted by Graf, that the verses were written by the second Isaiah (on this point, see our remarks at p. 7, note), and partly on a combination of results obtained by criticism, in which even their author has little confidence. But (2) we must also bear in mind the nature of the verses in question. They form a repetition of what we find in xxx. 10, 11, and a repetition, too, quite in the style of Jeremiah, who makes variations in expression. Thus here, in ver. 27, נָאָם יְהֹוָה is omitted after עַקְבָּעַי, perhaps simply because ver. 26 concludes with נָאָם יְהֹוָה; again, in ver. 20, אַפְתָּה אֶל-תִּרְאָעַבְדֵי יְעַקּוֹב is repeated with נָאָם יְהֹוָה, which is wanting in xxx. 11. On the

other hand, **לְהַשְׁעָךְ** in xxx. 11a, and **שָׁם** in xxx. 11b, have been dropped; **הַפְּצִוִּיךְ שָׁם** (xxx. 11) has been exchanged for **הַדְּחִתִּיךְ שָׁבֵתָה**. Hence Hitzig has taken the text here to be the better and the original one; and on this he finds the supposition that the verses were first placed here in the text, and were only afterwards, and from this passage, inserted in chap. xxx. 10, 11, where, however, they stand in the best connection, and even for that reason could not be a gloss inserted there. Such are some of the contradictions in which critical scepticism involves itself. We have already given an explanation of these verses under chap. xxx.

Chap. xlvii. *Concerning the Philistines.*

Ver. 1. *Title.*—The word of the Lord against the Philistines came to Jeremiah “before Pharaoh smote Gaza.” If we understand this time-definition in such a way that “the prophecy would refer to the conquest of Gaza by Pharaoh,” as Graf thinks, and as Hitzig also is inclined to suppose, then this portion of the title does not accord with the contents of the following prophecy; for, according to ver. 2, the devastator of Philistia approaches from the north, and the desolation comes not merely on Gaza, but on all Philistia, and even Tyre and Sidon (vers. 4, 5). Hence Graf thinks that, if any one is inclined to consider the title as utterly incorrect, only two hypotheses are possible: either the author of the title overlooked the statement in ver. 2, that the hostile army was to come from the north; in which case this conquest might have taken place at any time during the wearisome struggles, fraught with such changes of fortune, between the Chaldeans and the Egyptians for the possession of the border fortresses, during the reign of Jehoiakim (which is Ewald’s opinion): or he may possibly have noticed the statement, but found no difficulty in it; in which case, in spite of all opposing considerations (see M. von Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assyr. und Bab.* p. 369), it must be assumed that the conquest was effected by the defeated army as it was returning from the Euphrates, when Necho, on his march home, reduced Gaza (Hitzig), and by taking this fortress from the enemy, barred the way to Egypt. Of these two alternatives, we can accept neither as probable. The neglect, on the part of the author of

the title, to observe the statement that the enemy is to come from the north, would show too great carelessness for us to trust him. But if he did notice the remark, then it merely follows that Pharaoh must have reduced Gaza on his return, after being defeated at Carchemish. Nor is it legitimate to conclude, as Ewald does, from the statement in 2 Kings xxiv. 7 ("The king of Egypt went no more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken all that had belonged to the king of Egypt, from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates"), that the wars between the Chaldeans and the Egyptians for the possession of the border fortresses, such as Gaza, were tedious, and attended with frequent changes of fortune. In the connection in which it stands, this statement merely shows that, after Nebuchadnezzar had made Jehoiakim his vassal, the latter could not receive any help from Egypt in his rebellion, after he had ruled three years, because Pharaoh did not venture to march out of his own territory any more. But it plainly follows from this, that Pharaoh cannot have taken the fortress of Gaza while retreating before Nebuchadnezzar. For, in this case, Nebuchadnezzar would have been obliged to drive him thence before ever he could have reduced King Jehoiakim again to subjection. The assumption is difficult to reconcile with what Berosus says regarding the campaign of Nebuchadnezzar, viz. that he continued in the field till he heard of the death of his father. Add to this, that, as M. von Niebuhr very rightly says, "there is every military probability against it" (*i.e.* against the assumption that Gaza was reduced by Necho on his retreat). "If this fortress had stood out till the battle of Carchemish, then it is inconceivable that a routed eastern army should have taken the city during its retreat, even though there were, on the line of march, the strongest positions on the Orontes, in Lebanon, etc., where it might have taken its stand." Hence Niebuhr thinks it "infinitely more improbable either that Gaza was conquered before the battle of Carchemish, about the same time as Ashdod, and that Jeremiah, in chap. xlviij., predicts the approach of the army which was still engaged in the neighbourhood of Nineveh; or that the capture of the fortress did not take place till later, when Nebuchadnezzar was again engaged in Babylon, and that the prophet announces his return, not his first approach."

Rosenmüller and Nägelsbach have declared in favour of the first of these suppositions. Both of them place the capture of Gaza in the time of Necho's march against the Assyrians under Josiah; Rosenmüller before the battle of Megiddo; Nägelsbach after that engagement, because he assumes, with all modern expositors, that Necho had landed with his army at the Bay of Acre. He endeavours to support this view by the observation that Necho, before marching farther north, sought to keep the way clear for a retreat to Egypt, since he would otherwise have been lost after the battle of Carchemish, if he did not previously reduce Gaza, the key of the high road to Egypt. In this, Nägelsbach rightly assumes that the heading, "before Pharaoh smote Gaza," was not intended to show the fulfilment of the prophecy in the conquest of Gaza by Necho soon afterwards, but merely states that Jeremiah predicts to the Philistines that they will be destroyed by a foe from the north, at a time when conquest by a foe from the north was impending over them. Rightly, too, does Niebuhr remark that, in support of the view that Gaza was taken after the battle at Carchemish, there is nothing more than the announcement of the attack from the north, and the arrangement of the prophecies in Jeremiah, in which that against the Philistines is placed after that about the battle at Carchemish. Hitzig and Graf lay great weight upon this order and arrangement, and thence conclude that all the prophecies against the nations in chap. xlvi.-xlix., with the exception of that regarding Elam, were uttered in the fourth year of Jehoiakin. There are no sufficient grounds for this conclusion. The agreement between this prophecy now before us and that in chap. xlvi., as regards particular figures and expressions (Graf), is too insignificant to afford a proof that the two belong to the same time; nor is much to be made out of the point so strongly insisted on by Hitzig, that after the Egyptians, as the chief nation, had been treated of, the author properly brings forward those who, from the situation of their country, must be visited by war immediately before it is sent on the Egyptians. The main foundation for this view is taken from the notice by Herodotus (ii. 159), that Necho, after the battle at *Magdolos*, took the large Syrian city *Kádutis*. Magdolos is here taken as a variation of *Megiddo*, and Kadytis of

Gaza. But neither Hitzig nor Stark have proved the identity of Kadytis with Gaza, as we have already remarked on 2 Kings xxiii. 33; so that we cannot safely draw any conclusion, regarding the time when Gaza was taken, from that statement of Herodotus. In consequence of the want of evidence from other sources, the date of this event cannot be more exactly determined.

From the contents of this prophecy and its position among the oracles against the nations, we can draw no more than a very probable inference that it was not published before the fourth year of Jehoiakim, inasmuch as it is evidently but a further amplification of the sentence pronounced in that year against all the nations, and recorded in chap. xxv. Thus all conjectures as to the capture of Gaza by Necho on his march to the Euphrates, before the battle at Carchemish, become very precarious. But the assumption is utterly improbable also, that Necho at a later period, whether in his flight before the Chaldeans, or afterwards, while Nebuchadnezzar was occupied in Babylon, undertook an expedition against Philistia: such a hypothesis is irreconcilable with the statement given in 2 Kings xxiv. 7. There is thus no course left open for us, but to understand, by the Pharaoh of the title here, not Necho, but his successor Hophra: this has been suggested by Raschi, who refers to Jer. xxxvii. 5, 11, and by Perizonius, in his *Origg. Ægypt.* p. 459, who founds on the notices of Herodotus (ii. 261) and of Diodorus Siculus, i. 68, regarding the naval battle between Apries on the one hand and the Cyprians and Phœnicians on the other. From these notices, it appears pretty certain that Pharaoh-Hophra sought to avenge the defeat of Necho on the Chaldeans, and to extend the power of Egypt in Asia. Hence it is also very probable that he took Gaza, with the view of getting into his hands this key of the highway to Egypt. This assumption we regard as the most probable, since nothing has been made out against it; there are no sufficient grounds for the opinion that this prophecy belongs to the same time as that in chap. xlvi.

Contents of the Prophecy.—From the north there pours forth a river, inundating fields and cities, whereupon lamentation begins. Every one flees in haste before the sound of the

hostile army, for the day of desolation is come on all Philistia and Phœnicia (vers. 2-4). The cities of Philistia mourn, for the sword of the Lord is incessantly active among them (vers. 5-7). This brief prophecy thus falls into two strophes: in the first (vers. 2-4), the ruin that is breaking over Philistia is described; in the second (vers. 5-7), its operation on the country and on the people.

Ver. 2. "Thus saith Jahveh: Behold, waters shall rise up out of the north, and shall become an inundating stream, and they shall inundate the land and its fulness, cities and those who dwell in them; and men shall cry, and all the inhabitants of the land shall howl. Ver. 3. Because of the sound of the trampling of the hoofs of his strong horses, because of the din of his chariots, the noise of his wheels, fathers do not look back to their children from weakness of hands; Ver. 4. Because of the day that cometh to destroy all the Philistines, to cut off from Tyre and Zidon every one remaining as a helper; for Jahveh destroyeth the Philistines, the remnant of the coast of Capthor. Ver. 5. Baldness is come upon Gaza; Ashkelon is destroyed, the rest of their plain. How long wilt thou cut thyself? Ver. 6. O sword of Jahveh, how long wilt thou not rest? Draw thyself back into thy sheath; rest, and be still. Ver. 7. How canst thou be quiet, when Jahveh hath commanded thee? Against Ashkelon and against the sea-coast, there hath He appointed it."

The address opens with a figure. The hostile army that is to devastate Philistia is represented as a stream of water, breaking forth from the north, and swelling to an overflowing winter-torrent, that inundates the country and cities with their inhabitants. The figure is often used: cf. xlvi. 7, 8, where the Egyptian host is compared to the waves of the Nile; and Isa. viii. 7, where the Assyrian army is likened to the floods of the Euphrates. The simile is applied here in another way. The figure is taken from a strong spring of water, coming forth in streams out of the ground, in the north, and swelling to an overflowing winter-torrent, that pours out its floods over Philistia, laying it waste. "From the north" is used here as in xlvi. 20, and points back to i. 13, 14. "An inundating stream" is here employed as in Isa. xxx. 20; "earth and its fulness, a city and those who dwell in it," as in viii. 16. In

ver. 3 follows the application of the figure. It is a martial host that overflows the land, and with its mighty noise puts the inhabitants in such terror that they think only of a hasty flight; even fathers do not turn back to save their children. **שְׁעִטָּה**,

ἀπ. **λεγ.**, Syriac **מַלְאָה**, *incedere, gradi*, hence probably the stamping of hoofs. **אֲבִירִים**, strong horses, as in viii. 16. **לְרַכְבָּו**, instead of the construct state, has perhaps been chosen only for the sake of introducing a variation; cf. Ewald, § 290, *a*. **הַבָּנָה**, to turn the back, as in xlvi. 5. “ Slackness of hands,” *i.e.* utter loss of courage through terror; cf. vi. 24 (the form **רַכְבִּין** only occurs here). In ver. 4 the deeper source of fear is mentioned; “because of the day,” *i.e.* because the day has come to destroy all the Philistines, namely, the day of the judgment determined by the Lord; cf. xlvi. 10. “In order to destroy every remnant helping Tyre and Zidon.” **שְׁרִיד עַזָּר** are the Philistines, who could afford help to the Phœnicians in the struggle against the Chaldean power. This implies that the Phœnicians also shall perish without any one to help them. This indirect mention of the Phœnicians appears striking, but it is to be explained partly on the ground that Jeremiah has uttered special prophecies only against the chief enemies of Judah, and partly also perhaps from the historical relations, *i.e.* from the fact that the Philistines might have afforded help to the Phœnicians in the struggles against the great powers of the world. Hitzig unnecessarily seeks to take **לְעַזָּר וְלְאַזְרָן** as the object, and to expunge **עַזָּר** as a gloss. The objections which he raises against the construction are groundless, as is shown by such passages as xliv. 7, Isa. xiv. 22, 1 Kings xiv. 10, etc. “The remaining helper” is the expression used, because the other nations that could help the Egyptians, viz. the Syrians and Phœnicians, had already succumbed to the Chaldean power. The destruction will be so great as this, because it is Jahveh who destroys the Philistines, the remnant of the coast of Caphtor. According to Amos ix. 7, Deut. ii. 23, the Philistines came from Caphtor; hence **שְׁאָרִית אֵי כָּפְטוֹר** can only mean “what still remains of the people of Philistia who come from the coast of Caphtor,” like “the remnant of the Philistines” in Amos i. 8. Opinions are divided as to

Caphtor. The prevailing view is that of Lakemacher, that Caphtor is the name of the island of Crete; but for this there are no tenable grounds: see on Zeph. ii. 5; and Delitzsch on Genesis, S. 248, Aufl. 4. Dietrich (in *Merx' Archiv.* i. S. 313 ff.) and Ebers (*Ægypten u. die Bücher Moses*, i. S. 130 ff.) agree in thinking that Caphtor is the shore of the Delta, but they explain the name differently. Dietrich derives it from the Egyptian *Kah-pet-Hôr* (district of Hor), which he takes to be the environs of the city of Buto, and the lake called after it (the modern *Burlos*), not far from the Sebennytic mouth of the Nile; Ebers, following the tablet of Canopus, in which the Egyptian name *Kfa* (*Kaf*) is given as that of Phœnicia, derives the name from *Kaf-t-ur*, *i.e.* the great *Kefa*, as the ancient seat of the Phœnicians on the shore of the Delta must have been called. But both explanations are still very doubtful, though there is no question about the migration of the Philistines from Egypt into Canaan.—Vers. 5-7. The prophet sees, in the spirit, the threatened desolation as already come upon Philistia, and portrays it in its effects upon the people and the country. “Baldness (a sign of the deepest and most painful sorrow) has come upon Gaza;” cf. Mic. i. 16. נִכְתָּה is rendered by the Vulgate *conticuit*. After this Graf and Nägelsbach take the meaning of being “speechless through pain and sorrow;” cf. Lam. ii. 10. Others translate “to be destroyed.” Both renderings are lexically permissible, for כַּמָּה and כַּמְּ have both meanings. In support of the first, the parallelism of the members has been adduced; but this is not decisive, for figurative and literal representations are often interchanged. On the whole, it is impossible to reach any definite conclusion; for both renderings give suitable ideas, and these not fundamentally different in reality the one from the other. שְׁאָרִית עַמּוֹקָם, “the rest of their valley” (the suffix referring to Gaza and Ashkelon), is the low country round about Gaza and Ashkelon, which are specially mentioned from their being the two chief fortresses of Philistia. עַמּוֹק is suitably applied to the low-lying belt of country, elsewhere called נִמְלָה, “the low country,” as distinguished from the hill-country; for נִמְלָה does not always denote a deep valley, but is also sometimes used, as in Josh. xvii. 16, etc., of the

plain of Jezreel, and of other plains which are far from being deeply-sunk valleys. Thus there is no valid reason for following the arbitrary translation of the LXX., *καὶ τὰ κατάλοιπα Ἐνακείμ*, and changing עַמְקִים into עַמְקָם, as Hitzig and Graf do; more especially is it utterly improbable that in the Chaldean period Anakim were still to be found in Philistia. The mention of them, moreover, is out of place here; and still less can we follow Graf in his belief that the inhabitants of Gath are the “rest of the Anakim.” In the last clause of ver. 5, Philistia is set forth as a woman, who tears her body (with her nails) in despair, makes incisions on her body; cf. xvi. 6, xli. 5. The question, “How long dost thou tear thyself?” forms a transition to the plaintive request, “Gather thyself,” i.e. draw thyself back into thy scabbard. But the seer replies, “How can it rest? for Jahveh hath given it a commission against Ashkelon and the Philistine sea-coast.” For שְׁמַנְתִּים, in ver. 7, we must read the 3d pers. fem. שְׁמַנְתִּים, as the following וְ shows. The form probably got into the text from an oversight, through looking at שְׁמַנְתִּים in ver. 6. חַזְקָה יָם, “the sea-coast,” a designation of Philistia, as in Ezek. xxv. 16.

The prophecy concludes without a glance at the Messianic future. The threatened destruction of the Philistines has actually begun with the conquest of Philistia by Nebuchadnezzar, but has not yet culminated in the extermination of the people. The extermination and complete extirpation are thus not merely repeated by Ezekiel, xxv. 15 ff., but after the exile the threats are once more repeated against the Philistines by Zechariah (ix. 5): they only reached their complete fulfilment when, as Zechariah announces, in the addition made to Isa. xiv. 30 ff., their idolatry also was removed from them, and their incorporation into the Church of God was accomplished through judgment. Cf. the remarks on Zeph. ii. 10.

Chap. xlviii. *Concerning Moab.*

The Moabites had spread themselves on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, where the Emims dwelt in former times (Deut. ii. 10). But previous to the immigration of the Israelites into Canaan, the Amorites, under King Sihon, had already taken forcible possession of the northern portion of this territory as

far as the Arnon (Num. xxi. 13). The Israelites, on their march through the desert, were not to treat the Moabites as enemies, nor touch their territory (Deut. ii. 9; cf. Judg. xi. 15, 18). But when Sihon, king of the Amorites, had been slain by the Israelites, and his kingdom subdued, the Israelites took possession of the territory north of the Arnon, that had formerly belonged to the Moabites, but had been conquered by Sihon: this was given to the tribe of Reuben for an inheritance (Num. xxi. 24 ff.; Deut. ii. 32-36; Josh. xiii. 15 ff.). The Moabites could not get over this loss of the northern half of their country. The victory of the Israelites over the powerful kings of the Amorites, viz. Sihon in Heshbon and Og of Bashan, inspired them with terror for the power of this people; so that their king Balak, while the Israelites were encamped in the steppes of Moab opposite Jericho, fetched Balaam the sorcerer from Mesopotamia, with the design of destroying Israel through the power of his anathema. And when this plan did not succeed, since Balaam was obliged, against his will, to bless Israel instead of cursing them, the Moabites sought to weaken them, and to render them powerless to do any injury, by seducing them to idolatry (cf. Num. xxii.-xxv.). Such malicious conduct was shown repeatedly afterwards. Not long after the death of Joshua, Eglon the king of Moab, aided by the Ammonites and Amalekites, crossed the Jordan and took Jericho, which he made the centre of operations for keeping the Israelites under subjection: these were thus oppressed for eighteen years, until they succeeded in defeating the Moabites and driving them back into their own land, after Ehud had assassinated King Eglon (Judg. iii. 12 ff.). At a later period, Saul made war on them (1 Sam. xiv. 47); and David completely subdued them, severely chastised them, and made them tributary (2 Sam. viii. 2). But after the death of Ahab, to whom King Mesha had paid a very considerable yearly tribute (2 Kings iii. 4), they revolted from Israel (2 Kings i. 1, iii. 5). In the time of Jehoshaphat, in conjunction with the Ammonites and a portion of the Edomites, they even invaded Judah, with the design of taking Jerusalem; but they ruined themselves through mutual discords, so that Jehoshaphat obtained a glorious victory over them (2 Chron. xx.).

It was possibly also with the view of taking revenge for this exhibition of malicious spirit that the king of Judah afterwards, in conjunction with Joram king of Israel, carried war into their country, and defeated them (2 Kings iii. 6-27). Still later, mention is made of an invasion of Israel by Moabite hosts during the reign of Joash (2 Kings xiii. 20); and in the time of Hezekiah, we find them once more in possession of their ancient territory to the north of the Arnon, at a time when the trans-Jordanic tribes of Israel had been carried away by the Assyrians into exile.

Judging from these aphoristic notices, the Moabites, on the division of the kingdom after Solomon's death, seem to have remained tributary to the kingdom of the ten tribes until the death of Ahab; then they revolted, but soon afterwards were once more reduced to subjection by Joram and Jehoshaphat. Still later, they certainly made several invasions into Israel, but without permanent result; nor was it till the carrying away of the trans-Jordanic tribes by the Assyrians that they succeeded in regaining permanent possession of the depopulated land of Reuben, their former territory. This account, however, has been modified in several important respects by the recent discovery of an inscription on a monument raised by King Mesha after a victory he had gained; this "Moabite stone" was found in the neighbourhood of the ancient Dibon. The deciphering of the long inscription of thirty-four lines on this memorial stone, so far as success has followed the attempts hitherto made, has issued in its giving important disclosures concerning the relation of Moab to Israel.¹ From these we gather that Omri,

¹ On the discovery of this memorial stone, of which Count de Vogüé gave the first account in a paper entitled "*La stèle de Mésa: Lettre à Mr. le Comte de Vogüé par Ch. Clermont-Ganneau*," Paris 1870, cf. the detailed notice by Petermann in the *Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morg. Gesell.* xxiv. (for 1870), S. 640 ff. The stone was broken to pieces by the Arabs; thus, unfortunately, the whole of the inscription has not been preserved. So much, however, of the fragments has been saved, that from these the contents of the inscription may be substantially obtained with tolerable certainty. The work of deciphering has been undertaken by Konst. Schlottmann (*Ueber die Siegessäule Mesa's, Königs der Moabiter*, Hall. Osterprogr. 1870, with these additions: "*Die Inschrift Mesa's; Transcription u. Uebersetzung revidirt*," in the *Zeitschr. der Morg. Gesell.* xxiv. S. 253 ff.; "*Additamenta*" in the same periodical, S. 415 ff., 438 ff., 645 ff.; and "*Der Moabiterkönig*

king of Israel, had taken possession of the district of Medeba, and that the Moabites were heavily oppressed by him and his successor for forty years, until King Mesha succeeded, through the help of his god Chemosh, in regaining the territory that had been seized by the Israelites. We may further with certainty conclude, from various statements in this inscription, that the Moabites were by no means exterminated by the Israelites, when they took possession of the country to the north of the Arnon, which had been seized by the Amorites; they continued to live beside and among the Israelites. Moreover, since the tribe of Reuben was chiefly engaged in the rearing of cattle, and thus appropriated the pastoral districts of the country, the Moabites were not utterly, at least not permanently subdued, but rather took every opportunity of weakening the Israelites, in order not merely to reclaim their old possessions, but also to make themselves independent of Israel. This object they seem to have actually attained, even so soon as immediately after the death of Solomon. They continued independent until the powerful Omri restored the supremacy of Israel in the territory of Reuben; and Moab continued subject for forty years, at the end of which King Mesha again succeeded in breaking the yoke of Israel after the death of Ahab. Thenceforward, Israel never again got the upper hand, though Jeroboam II. (as we are entitled to conclude from 2 Kings xiv. 25) may have disputed the supremacy with the Moabites for a time.

Amos (ii. 1-3) and Isaiah (chap. xv. and xvi.) have already, *Mesa nach seiner Inschrift und nach den bibl. Berichten*, in the *Theol. Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1871, S. 587 ff.), also by Theod. Nöldeke ("Die Inschrift des K. Mesa," Kiel 1870), Ferd. Hitzig ("Die Inschrift des Mesha," Heidelb. 1870), Himpel (in the *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1870, H. 4, and in *Merx' Archiv*, ii. S. 96 ff.), Diestel ("Die moabit. Gedenktafel," in the *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1871 (H. 4), S. 215 ff.), Rabbi Dr. Geiger ("Die Säule des Mesa," in the *Zeitschr. der Morg. Ges.* xxiv. S. 212 ff.), Dr. Ginsburg ("The Moabite Stone," Lond. 1870), Ganneau (in the *Révue archéol.*); by Derenburg and others (in German, English, and French periodicals). [In addition to the work of Dr. Ginsburg, mentioned above, the English reader may consult an able article by Professor Wright in the *North British Review* for October 1870; one by W. H. Ward in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* of the same date; and another by Prof. A. B. Davidson in the *British and Foreign Evangelical Review* for January 1871.—Tr.]

before Jeremiah, threatened Moab with destruction, because of the acts of hostility against Israel of which they have been guilty. We have no historical notice concerning the fulfilment of these threatenings. Inasmuch as the power of the Assyrians in Eastern Asia was broken through the defeat of Sennacherib before Jerusalem, the Moabites may possibly have asserted their independence against the Assyrians. Certainly it seems to follow, from the remark in 1 Chron. v. 17 (that the families of Gad were reckoned by genealogies in the days of Jotham king of Judah), that some of the Israelites on the east of Jordan came for a time under the sway of Judah. But even though this were allowed to hold true of the tribe of Reuben also, such a mastery could not have lasted long, since even towards the end of Jotham's reign, Pekah the king of Israel joined with Hazael king of Syria in war against Judah (2 Kings xv. 37); and during the reign of Ahaz, Rezin invaded Gilead, and penetrating as far as the seaport of Elath, took it from Judah (2 Kings xvi. 6). At all events, up till the time of Nebuchadnezzar, the threats of Amos and Isaiah had attained only the feeblest beginnings of fulfilment; and (as is abundantly evident from the prophecy in this chapter) the Moabites were then more powerful than ever they had been before, and in undisturbed possession also of that portion of their ancient territory lying north of the Arnon, which had been taken from them by Sihon the Amorite; and after his defeat, the victorious Israelites had again apportioned it to the tribe of Reuben.

This prophecy of Jeremiah concerning Moab is to be explained on the ground of these historical relations. The day of ruin was to begin with the appearance of the Chaldeans in Palestine; this day had been predicted not merely by Amos and Isaiah, but even by Balaam, on the occasion of the first conflict of the Moabites with Israel. Jeremiah accordingly takes up anew the utterances of the old prophets regarding Moab which had not yet been fulfilled, but were now about to receive their accomplishment: these he reproduces in his own peculiar manner, taking as his foundation the oracular sentences of Isaiah concerning Moab, and combining these by means of the utterances of Amos and Balaam, not only regarding Moab, but also regarding the whole heathen world now ripe

for judgment; and out of all this he frames a comprehensive announcement of the ruin to fall on this people, so haughty, and so filled with hatred against Israel.¹

The contents of this announcement are as follow:—The chief cities of Moab are perished, and with them their fame. Plans are being concocted for their destruction. On all sides there is a crying over the devastation, and wailing, and flight; Chemosh, with his priests and princes, wanders into exile, and country and city are laid waste (vers. 1–8). Let Moab escape with wings, in order to avoid the destruction; for although they have, in all time past, lived securely in their own land, they shall now be driven out of their dwellings, and come to dishonour with their god Chemosh, in spite of the bravery of their heroes (vers. 9–15). The destruction of Moab draws near, their glory perishes, the whole country and all its towns are laid waste, and the power of Moab is broken (vers. 16–25). All this befalls them for their pride and loftiness of spirit; because of this they are punished, with the destruction of their glorious vines and their harvest; and the whole land becomes filled with sorrow and lamentation over the desolation, and the extermination of all those who make offerings to idols (vers. 26–35). Meanwhile the prophet mourns with the hapless people, who are broken like a despised vessel (vers. 36–38). Moab becomes the laughing-stock and the horror of all around: the enemy captures all their fortresses, and none shall escape the ruin (vers. 39–44). Fire goes out from Heshbon and destroys the whole land, and the

¹ This reproduction Gesenius (on *Isaiah*, p. 511) characterizes as “a feeble imitation, by which the text of the older author is made quite diffuse and watery, frequently mixed through in a wonderful manner, made into a kind of patchwork, and enlivened now and again by a stiff turn.” Movers and Hitzig have spoken still more depreciatingly of this chapter, and excised a great number of verses, on the ground of their having been introduced later by way of touching up; in this manner, Hitzig rejects as spurious verses which Movers recognises as exhibiting marks of Jeremiah’s peculiar style,—a method of procedure which Graf has already denounced as arbitrary criticism. We hope to show in the commentary the total want of foundation for this pseudo-critical mode of dealing; we only make the further remark here by anticipation, that Kueper (on *Jeremiah*, p. 83 sqq.) has very clearly accounted for and vindicated the conduct of Jeremiah in making use of the expressions of previous prophets, while Movers and Hitzig have paid no regard to this thorough kind of work.

people must go into captivity ; but at the end of the days, the Lord will turn the captivity of Moab (vers. 45-47). According to this view of the whole, this prophecy falls into seven strophes of unequal length, of which every one concludes either with מִצְרָיִם נִזְחָם or נִזְחָם מִצְרָיִם. The middle one, which is also the longest (vers. 26-35), forms an apparent exception, inasmuch as מִצְרָיִם does not stand at the end, but in the middle of ver. 35 ; while in the second last strophe (vers. 39-44), the last two verses (43 and 44) end with this formula.

Vers. 1-8. *Calamities to come on Moab.*—Ver. 1. “ Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel, Woe to Nebo, for it is laid waste ! Kiriathaim is come to dishonour, it is taken : the fortress is come to dishonour and broken down. Ver. 2. Moab’s glory is no more. In Heshbon they have devised evil against her, [saying], Come, and let us cut her off from [being] a nation : thou also, O Madmen, art brought to silence ; the sword shall go after thee. Ver. 3. A sound of crying from Horonaim, desolation and great destruction. Ver. 4. Moab is destroyed ; her little ones have caused a cry to be heard. Ver. 5. For they ascend the ascent of Luhith with weeping,—weeping : for on the descent of Horonaim the enemies have heard a cry of destruction. Ver. 6. Flee, save your life ! and be like one destitute in the wilderness. Ver. 7. For, because thy trust [was] in thy works, and in thy treasures, thou also shalt be taken ; and Chemosh shall go into captivity, his priests and his princes together. Ver. 8. The destroyer shall come to every city, and no city shall escape ; and the valley shall perish, and the plain shall be laid waste, as Jahveh hath said.”

With the exclamation “ Woe ! ” Jeremiah transports the hearers of the word of God at once into the midst of the catastrophe which is to come on Moab ; this is with the view of humbling the pride of this people, and chastening them for their sins. The woe is uttered over Nebo, but holds also of the towns named afterwards. Nebo is not the mountain of that name (Deut. xxxii. 49, xxxiv. 1), but the city, which probably did not lie far from the peak in the mountain-range of Abarim, which bore the same name (Num. xxxii. 3, 38 ; Isa. xv. 2), although in the *Onomasticon*, s.v. *Naβaū*, the situation of the mountain is given as being six Roman miles from Heshbon, towards the

west, and *s.v.* *Naθōp*, that of the city, eight Roman miles south from Heshbon, for both accounts point to a situation in the south-west. The name קִרְיָתָהִים is still applied to some ruins; cf. Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. p. 170. "Kiriathaim is taken." The site of this town, mentioned as early as Gen. xiv. 5, has been fixed, since the time of Burckhardt, as that of a mass of ruins called *et Teim*, about five miles south of Heshbon; but Dietrich, in *Merx' Archiv.* i. S. 337 ff., has shown that this is incorrect. According to Eusebius, in his *Onomasticon*, Kiriathaim lay ten Roman miles to the west of Medeba: this suits not merely the position of *et Teim*, but also the ruins of *Kereyat* south-west from Medeba, on the ridge of Mount Attarus, a little to the south of M'kaur (*Machaerus*), and of Baara in the *Wady Zerka Maein*, where also is the plain mentioned in Gen. xiv. 5, either in the plain stretching direct east from *Kereyat* between *Wady Zerka Maein* and *Wady Wal*, or south-east in the beautiful plain *el Kura*, described by Burckhardt, p. 371 ff., between the *Wal* and the *Mojob*. *Nebo* and *Kiriathaim* lay on the eastern border of the high range of mountains, and seem to be comprehended under קִרְיָתָהִים, "the height, the high fortress," in the third clause of ver. 1, as the representatives of the mountain country of Moab. Various expositors, certainly, take the word as a proper name designating an elevated region; Graf and Nägelsbach take it to be a name of *Kir-Moab* (*Kir-heres*, *Kir-haresheth*, vers. 31, 36), the chief fortress in the country, the modern *Kerek* in the southern part of Moab; but no valid proof has been adduced. By "the height" Hitzig understands the highlands, which learn of the fall of these towns in the lowlands, and feel this disgrace that has come on Moab, but have not yet themselves been taken. But this view is untenable, because the towns of *Nebo* and *Kiriathaim* are not situated in the level country. Again, since קִרְיָתָהִים is common to the two clauses, the distinction between נִלְבְּרָה and קִרְמָה could hardly be pressed so far as to make the latter the opposite of the former, in the sense of being still unconquered. The meaning rather is, that through *Nebo's* being laid waste, and the capture of *Kiriathaim*, the fortress on which the Moabites trusted is no more. And to this ver. 3 appropriately adds, "the boasting of Moab

is gone," *i.e.* Moab has no more ground for boasting. "In Heshbon they (the enemy, or the conquerors) plot evil against Moab." Heshbon was formerly the capital of the Amorite kingdom of Sihon (Num. xxi. 26; Deut. ii. 24, etc.), and was assigned to the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 17); but because it lay on the boundary of the territory belonging to the tribe, it was given up to the Gadites, and set apart as a Levitical city (Josh. xxi. 37). It lay ten Roman miles east from the Jordan, opposite Jericho, almost intermediate between the Arnon and the Jabbok, and is still pointed out, though in ruins, under the old name *Heshbán* (see on Num. xxxii. 37). At the time of Jeremiah it was taken possession of by the Ammonites (Jer. xlix. 3), consequently it was the frontier town of the Moabite territory at that time; and being such, it is here named as the town where the enemy, coming from the north, deliberate regarding the conquest of Moab—"meditate evil," *i.e.* decide upon conquest and devastation. The suffix of **עֲלֵיתָה** refers to Moab as a country, and hence is feminine; cf. ver. 4. "We will destroy it (Moab, so that it shall no longer be a nation)." Just as in **בְּחַשְׁבָּן הַשְׁבָּן** there is a play on the words, so is there also in the expression **מַרְמָן תְּלַפְּיָה** which follows. This very circumstance forms an argument for taking *Madmen* as a proper name, instead of an appellative, as Venema and Hitzig have done, after the example of the LXX.: "Yea, thou shalt be destroyed (and made into) a dunghill." In support of this rendering they point to 2 Kings x. 27, Ezra vi. 11. But the verb **מַרְמָן**, in its meaning, ill accords with **מַרְמָן** in the sense of a dung-heap, and in this case there would be no foundation for a play upon the words (Graf). It is no proof of the non-existence of a place called *Madmen* in Moab, that it is not mentioned elsewhere; *Madmena* in the tribe of Benjamin (Isa. x. 31), and *Madmann* in Judah (Josh. xv. 31), are also mentioned but once. These passages rather show that the name *Madmen* was not uncommon; and it was perhaps with reference to this name that Isaiah (xxv. 10) chose the figure of the dunghill. **מַרְמָן**, to be silent, means, in the Niphal, to be brought to silence, be exterminated, perish; cf. xlix. 26, xxv. 37, viii. 14, etc. As to the form **תְּלַפְּיָה** instead of **תְּלַפְּיָה**, cf. Ewald, § 140, *b*; Gesenius, § 67, Rem. 5. The following clause refers to *Madmen*: "after thee shall the sword

go ;" cf. ix. 15.—Ver. 3. A cry is heard from Horonaim against violence and destruction. The words שָׁדָּה וְשִׁבְּרָה פָּרוֹל are to be taken as the cry itself; cf. iv. 20, xx. 8. The city of Horonaim, mentioned both here and in Isa. xv. 5 in connection with Luhith, lay on a slope, it would seem, not far from Luhith. Regarding this latter place we find it remarked in the *Onomasticon: est usque hodie vicus inter Areopolim et Zoaram nomine Luiitha* (Λουειθά). As to 'Ωροναιέμ, the *Onomasticon* says no more than πόλις Μωὰβ ἐν Ιερεμίᾳ (ed. Lars. p. 376). The destruction over which the outcry is made comes on Moab. By "Moab" Graf refuses to understand the country or its inhabitants, but rather the ancient capital of the country, *Ar-Moab* (Num. xxi. 28; Isa. xv. 1), in the valley of the Arnon, which is also simply called *Ar* in Num. xxi. 15, Deut. ii. 9. But, as Dietrich has already shown (S. 329 ff.), the arguments adduced in support of this view are insufficient to prove the point.¹ שִׁבְּרָה, to break,—of a nation or a city (xix. 11; Isa. xiv. 25, etc.), as it were, to ruin,—is here used of the country or kingdom. צָעֹרְךָ is for צָעֹרְךָ, as in xiv. 3. The little ones of Moab, that raise a cry, are neither the children (Vulgate, Dahler, Maurer), nor the small towns (Hitzig), nor the people of humble condition, but *cives Moabi ad statum miserum dejecti* (Kueper). The LXX. have rendered *eis Zoyópa* (i.e. צָעֹרָה), which reading is preferred by J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Umbreit, Graf, Nägelsbach, but without sufficient reason; for neither the occurrence of Zoar in combination with Horonaim in ver. 34, nor the parallel passage Isa. xv. 5, will prove the point. Isa. xv. 5 is not a parallel to this verse, but to ver. 34; however, the train of thought is diffe-

¹ The mention of Moab among names of cities in ver. 4, and in connection with Kir-heres in vers. 31 and 36, proves nothing; for in ver. 4 Moab is not named among towns, and the expression in vers. 31 and 36 is analogous to the phrase "Judah and Jerusalem." Nor can any proof be derived from the fact that Rabbath-Moab is merely called "Moab" in the *Onomasticon* of Eusebius, and *Māb* in Abulfeda, and Rabbath-Ammon, now merely "Amman;" because this mode of speaking will not admit of being applied for purposes of proof to matters pertaining to Old Testament times, since it originated only in the Christian ages,—at a time, too, when Rabbath had become the capital of the country, and when Rabbath-Moab could easily be shortened by the common people into "Moab." Rabbath (of Moab), however, is not mentioned at all in the Old Testament.

rent from that before us here. Besides, Jeremiah writes the name of the town צֹעַר (not צֹעַר), cf. ver. 34, as in Isa. xv. 5, Deut. xxxiv. 3, Gen. xiii. 10 (צֹעַר occurs only in Gen. xix. 22, 30); hence it is unlikely that צֹעַר has been written by mistake for צֹעַר.

In ver. 5 this idea is further elucidated. The inhabitants flee, weeping as they go, towards the south, before the conquering enemy advancing from the north, up the ascent of Luhith, and down the descent of Horonaim. The idea is taken from Isa. xv. 5, but applied by Jeremiah in his own peculiar manner; and עַלְהָ בָּוּ is changed into עַלְהָ בְּכִי, and the notion of weeping is thereby intensified. We take as an adverbial accusative, but in fact it is to be rendered like the preceding בְּכִי; and עַלְהָ stands with an indefinite nominative: "one ascends=they ascend," not "weeping rises over weeping," as Hitzig, Graf, and others take it. For, in the latter case, בְּכִי could not be separated from בְּכִי, nor stand first; cf. the instances adduced by Graf, שְׁנָה בְּשָׁנָה and עַנְנָה בְּעַנְנָה. The form הַלְּחָות for הַלְּחִית is either an error of transcription or an optional form, and there is no ground for taking the word as appellative, as Hitzig does, "the ascent of boards, *i.e.* as boards tower one above another, so does weeping rise,"—an unnatural figure, and one devoid of all taste. The last words of the second member of the verse present some difficulty, chiefly on account of צְרִי, which the LXX. have omitted, and which Ewald and Umbreit set down as spurious, although (as Graf rightly remarks) they do not thereby explain how it came into the text. To suppose, with the Rabbinical writers, that the construct state צְרִי stands for the absolute, is not only inadmissible, as being against the principles of grammar, but also contrary to the whole scope of the passage. The context shows that the clamour cannot proceed from the enemy, but only from the fugitive Moabites. Only two explanations are possible: either צְרִי must be taken in the sense of *angustice*, and in connection with צְעַקָּת, "straits, distress of crying," a cry of distress, as De Wette does; or, "oppressors of the cry of distress," as Nägelsbach takes it. We prefer the former, in spite of the objection of Graf, that the expression "distress of crying," for "a cry of distress," would be a strange one: for this objection

may be made against his own explanation, that צָרִי means the bursting open of the mouth in making a loud cry; and צָרִי עֲזָקה is a loud outcry for help.—Ver. 6. Only by a precipitate flight into the desert can the Moabites save even their lives. The summons to flee is merely a rhetorical expression for the thought that there is no safety to be had in the country. To מהִנָּה in ver. 6 we must supply נֶפֶשׁוֹת as the subject: “your souls shall be.” Ewald would change נֶפֶשׁכֶם into נֶפֶשׁכָּם; but this proposal has against it the fact that the plural form נֶפֶשׁים is found in but a single case, Ezek. xiii. 20, and everywhere else: besides, נֶפֶשׁ is often used in the singular of several persons, as in 2 Sam. xix. 6, and may further be easily taken here in a distributive sense; cf. בְּלִטָּה אִישׁ נֶפֶשׁ, li. 6. The assumption of C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Maurer, [and of the translators of our “Authorized” English Version], that מהִנָּה is the second person, and refers to the cities, *i.e.* their inhabitants, is against the context. עֲרֹעֵר cannot here be the name of a town, because neither Aroer in the tribe of Reuben, which was situated on the Arnon, nor Aroer of the tribe of Gad, which was before Rabbath-Ammon, lay in the wilderness; the comparison, too, of the fugitives to a city is unsuitable. The clause reminds us of xvii. 6, and עֲרֹעֵר=the *Urash* of that passage; the form found here is either an error of transcription caused by thinking of Aroer, or a play upon the name of the city, for the purpose of pointing out the fate impending over it.—Ver. 7. Moab will not be saved from destruction by any trust on their works or on their treasures. The LXX., Vulgate, and Syriac render מַעֲשֵׂיךְ by fortresses, hence Ewald would read מַעֲזֵיכְ instead; but there is no ground for the change, since the peculiar rendering alluded to has evidently originated from מַעֲשָׂה having been confounded with מַעֲטָה. Others, as Dahler, refer the word to idols; but these are always designated as יְדָה. Graf translates “property,” and points to 1 Sam. xxv. 2, Ex. xxiii. 16; but this meaning also has really nothing to support it, for מַעֲשָׂה in these passages denotes only agriculture and its produce, and the combination of the word with אֲנִירֹות in this passage does not require such a rendering. We abide by the common meaning of “doings” or “works,” not evil deeds specially (Hitzig), but

“all that Moab undertakes.” Neither their efforts to maintain and increase their power, nor their wealth, will avail them in any way. They shall be overcome. Moab is addressed as a country or kingdom. לְכַר, to seize, capture; of a land, to take, conquer. Chemosh, with his priests and princes, shall go into exile. כְּמַיִשְׁפֵּת is perhaps a mere error of the copyist for כְּמַשְׁׁוֹשָׁן, Chemosh, the chief deity of the Moabites and Ammonites, worshipped as a king and the war-god of his people: see on Num. xxi. 29. As in the last-named passage the Moabites are called the people of Chemosh, so here, not merely the priests, but also the princes of Moab, are called his priests and his princes. The Kethib יִתְהַר is not to be changed, although Jeremiah elsewhere always uses יִתְהַרְּנִי, which is substituted in the Qeri; cf. xlix. 3. In confirmation of this, it is added, in ver. 8, that all the cities of Moab, without exception, shall be laid waste, and the whole country, valley and plain, shall be brought to ruin. הַכְּפִישׁוֹר, “the level,” is the table-land stretching from the Arnon to Heshbon, and north-eastwards as far as Rabbath-Ammon, and which originally belonged to the Moabites, hence called “the fields of Moab” in Num. xxi. 40; but it was taken from them by the Amorites, and after the conquest of the latter was taken possession of by the Israelites (Deut. iii. 10, iv. 43; Josh. xiii. 9), but at that time had been taken back once more by the Moabites. הַעֲמִקָּם is the valley of the Jordan, commonly called הָעֲרָבָה, as in Josh. xiii. 27 and 19; here it is that portion of the valley towards the west which bounds the table-land. אַשְׁר can only be taken in a causal signification, “because,” as in xvi. 13, or in a relative meaning, *quod*, or “as.”

Vers. 9-15. *Moab is laid waste, and its inhabitants carried captive.*—Ver. 9. “Give pinions to Moab, for he will flee and get away, and his cities shall become a waste, with no one dwelling in them. Ver. 10. Cursed is he that doeth the work of Jahveh negligently, and cursed is he that restraineth his sword from blood. Ver. 11. Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and lay still upon his lees; he was not poured out from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity, therefore his taste hath remained in him, and his smell hath not changed. Ver. 12. Therefore, behold, days come, saith Jahveh, when I will send

to him those who pour out, and they shall pour him out; and they shall empty his vessels, and break their bottles. Ver. 13. And Moab shall be ashamed of Chemosh, as the house of Israel was ashamed of Bethel their confidence. Ver. 14. How can ye say, We are mighty, and men of valour for the war? Ver. 15. Moab is laid waste, and people ascend into his cities, and the choice of his young men go down to the slaughter, saith the King, whose name is Jahveh of hosts."

The devastation will come so suddenly, that Moab, in order to escape it, uses wings for enabling him to flee from it. The request "give" is not ironical, but a mere rhetorical employment of the idea that wings would be necessary in order to escape. **רְנֵנָה**, which elsewhere means a flower, here signifies wings or waving plumes, as in the Targum on Ps. cxxxix. 9, and in the Rabbinical writings. **רְנֵנָה**, written with **נ** for the sake of obtaining similarity of sound, stands for **רְנֵנָה** = **רְנֵנָה**, to flee.—Ver. 10. The devastation is a work of the Lord, and those who execute it must carry out the divine decree, so that they may not bring the curse upon themselves. The first clause is taken quite generally: the more exact specification of the work of the Lord follows in the second clause; it is the employment of the sword against Moab. "His sword" does not mean Jaliveh's, but the sword carried by the devastator. **רְמִיה** is used adverbially, but not in the sense of "deceitfully," rather "carelessly, negligently;" cf. **רְמִיה** **בְּ**, Prov. x. 4, xii. 24. In ver. 11 follows the reason why the judgment has necessarily come on Moab. Moab is compared to old wine that has lain long on its lees, and thereby preserved its flavour and smell unchanged. The taste and odour of Moab signify his disposition towards other nations, particularly towards Israel, the people of God. Good wine becomes stronger and more juicy by lying pretty long on its lees (see on Isa. xxv. 6); inferior wine, however, becomes thereby more harsh and thick. The figure is used here in the latter sense, after Zeph. i. 12. Moab's disposition towards Israel was harsh and bitter; the people were arrogant and proud (ver. 29 f.; Isa. xvi. 6), and so hostile towards Israel, that they sought every opportunity of injuring them (see above, p. 205 f., and the comments on 2 Sam. viii. 2). From his youth, *i.e.* from the time when

Moab, after subduing the Emims (Deut. ii. 10), had established himself in his own land, or had become enrolled among the nations of history,—from that time forward had he remained undisturbed in his own land, *i.e.* without being driven out of it, had not gone into captivity (as is shown by the figure of the wine poured from one vessel into another). In this way there is a qualification made of the general statement that he remains at rest on his lees, and undisturbed. For Moab has often carried on wars, and even suffered many defeats, but has never yet been driven from his own land; nor had the temporary dependence on Israel exercised any transforming influence on the ordinary life of the people, for they were simply made tributary. This quiet continuance in the country is to cease. The God of Israel “will send to them cellarmen (Germ. *Schröter*), who shall bring them out of the cellar” (Germ. *ausschroten*), as Luther translates ver. 12. “*Schröter*” are men who bring the wine-casks out of the cellar; for “*schroten*” means to bring out heavy burdens, especially full casks on a strong kind of hand-barrow (Germ. *Hebewerkzeug*), like a ladder in appearance. מְעַזֵּן (from עָזֵן, to bend, incline) are those who incline a barrel or vessel for the purpose of pouring out its contents. These will not merely empty the vessels, but also break the pitchers; *i.e.* not merely carry away the Moabites, but also break down their political organization, and destroy their social arrangements.

Ver. 13. In this way Moab will come to dishonour through his god Chemosh, *i.e.* experience his powerlessness and nothingness, and perish with him, just as Israel (the ten tribes) came to dishonour through Bethel, *i.e.* through their golden calf at Bethel. As to the form מְבָטַחַם, with Segol in the pretone, cf. Ewald, § 70, *a*; Olshausen, *Gram.* S. 377. Moab will then be no longer able to boast of his valour; this is the meaning of the question in ver. 14: on this term in the address, cf. ii. 23, viii. 8. In ver. 15 it is further stated that the result will show this: “Moab is laid waste.” עַלְהַיְהַ עַלְהַיְהַ is variously interpreted. An explanation which has met with much acceptance, but which nevertheless is really untenable, is founded on Judg. xx. 40 (“The whole city went up towards heaven,” *i.e.* in smoke and fire): “As for his cities, fire or smoke ascends;” but there is no

mention here either of smoke or fire. Kimchi long ago came near the truth when he sought to find the subject שָׁדֵר in שָׁדֵר : “ and the devastator comes against his cities.” However, the contrast between מִלְעָעָד and יְרֵדָה is not fully brought out in this way : it is better to leave the subject indeterminate : “ and his cities they climb” (Kueper), or : “ they go up to his cities” (Böttcher, *Neue Ehrenlese*, ii. 163). The enemy who mounts the cities is evidently intended. To change שָׁדֵר into שָׁדֵד is both unnecessary and unsuitable ; but J. D. Michaelis, Ewald, Dahler, Graf, after making the alteration, translate, “ The destroyer of Moab and of his cities draws near.” Hitzig justly remarks, in opposition to this conjecture : “ There is nothing to justify the mere placing of the subject at the head of the sentence (contrast vers. 8, 18b) ; besides, one does not see why the cities of Moab are distinguished from Moab itself ; and cf. 20b.” שָׁדֵד לְבָתָה, “ to sink down to the slaughter,” cf. l. 27 ; and on this use of יְרֵד, Isa. xxxiv. 7. The enemy *ascends* into the cities, the young soldiers of Moab *descend* to the shambles. This threatening is enforced by the addition, “ saith the King,” etc. Jahveh is called the King, in contrast with the belief of the Moabites, that their god Chemosh was the king of his people (see on ver. 7). The true King of the Moabites also is Jahveh, the God of hosts, *i.e.* the Ruler of the whole world.

Vers. 16-25. *Moab's glory is departed.*—Ver. 16. “ The destruction of Moab is near to come, and his trouble hastens rapidly. Ver. 17. Bewail him, all [ye who are] round about him, and all who know his name ! Say, How the rod of strength is broken, the staff of majesty ! Ver. 18. Come down from [thy] glory, and sit in the drought, [thou] inhabitant, daughter of Dibon ; for the destroyer of Moab hath come up against thee, he hath destroyed thy strongholds. Ver. 19. Stand by the way, and watch, O inhabitant of Aroer ! ask him who flees, and her that has escaped ; say, What has happened ? Ver. 20. Moab is ashamed, for it is broken down : howl and cry out ; tell it in Arnon, that Moab is laid waste. Ver. 21. And judgment hath come upon the country of the plain, upon Holon, and upon Jahzah, and upon Mephaath, Ver. 22. And upon Dibon, and upon Nebo, and upon Beth-Diblathaim, Ver. 23. And upon Kirjathaim, and upon Beth-Gamul, and upon Beth-Meon,

Ver. 24. And upon Kerioth, and upon Bozrah, and upon all the cities of the land of Moab, those that are far off and those that are near. Ver. 25. The horn of Moab is cut off, and his arm is broken, saith Jahveh."

The downfall of Moab will soon begin. Ver. 16a is an imitation of Deut. xxxii. 35; cf. Isa. xiii. 22, lvi. 1. The fall of the Moabite power and glory will be so terrible, that all the nations, near and distant, will have pity on him. The summons to lament, ver. 17, is not a mockery, but is seriously meant, for the purpose of expressing the idea that the downfall of so mighty and glorious a power will rouse compassion. The environs of Moab are the neighbouring nations, and "those who know his name" are those who live far off, and have only heard about him. The staff, the sceptre, is the emblem of authority; cf. Ezek. xix. 11, 12, 14, and Ps. cx. 2. In vers. 18-25 is further described the downfall of this strong and glorious power. The inhabitants of Dibon are to come down from their glory and sit in misery; those of Aroer are to ask the fugitives what has happened, that they may learn that the whole table-land on to the Arnon has been taken by the enemy; and they are to howl over the calamity. The idea presented in ver. 18a is an imitation of that in Isa. xlvi. 1, "Come down, O daughter of Babylon, sit in the dust;" but רְדֵי is intensified by the addition of יְשַׁבֵּי, and מִפְבָּד is changed into בְּצָמָא (the *Kethib* יְשַׁבֵּי has evidently been written by mistake for יְשַׁבֵּי, the *Qeri*). צָמָא elsewhere means "thirst;" but "sit down in the thirst" would be too strange an expression; hence צָמָא must here have the meaning of נָאֵץ, Isa. xliv. 3, "the thirsty arid land;" thus it remains a question whether we should point the word צָמָא, or take צָמָא as another form of נָאֵץ, as חַלְבָּב is of חַלְבָּב, Ezek. xxiii. 19. There is no sufficient reason why Hitzig and Ewald should give the word a meaning foreign to it, from the Arabic or Syriac. Dibon lay about four miles north from the Arnon, at the foot of a mountain, in a very beautiful plain, where, under the name of *Dibân*, many traces of walls, and a well by the wayside, hewn out of the rock, are still to be found (Seetzen, i. S. 409 f.). Hence it must have been well provided with water, even though we should be obliged to understand by "the water of Dimon" (Dibon), which Isaiah mentions (xv. 9),

the river Arnon, which is about three miles off. The command to “sit down in an arid land” thus forms a suitable figure, representing the humiliation and devastation of Dibon. That the city was fortified, is evident from the mention of the fortifications in the last clause. **יְשַׁבְתָ בַת**, as in xlvi. 19. Aroer was situated on the north bank of the Arnon (*Mojeb*), where its ruins still remain, under the old name *Ar'dir* (Burckhardt, p. 372). It was a frontier town, between the kingdom of Sihon (afterwards the territory of the Israelites) and the possession of the Moabites (Deut. ii. 36, iii. 12, iv. 48; Josh. xii. 2, xiii. 9, 16). But after the Moabites had regained the northern portion of their original territory, it lay in the midst of the land. The fugitives here represented as passing by are endeavouring, by crossing the Arnon, to escape from the enemy advancing from the north, and subduing the country before them. **נָס וְנָמְלָתָה** means fugitives of every kind. The co-ordination of the same word or synonymous terms in the masc. and fem. serves to generalize the idea; see on Isa. iii. 1, and Ewald, § 172, c. In **נָמְלָתָה** the tone is retracted through the influence of the distinctive accent; the form is participial. The question, “What has happened?” is answered in ver. 20. **כִּי חָתָה**, “for (=certainly) it is broken down.” The *Kethib* **הַלִּיל וְחַעֲקֵר** must not be changed. Moab is addressed: with **הַנִּיר** is introduced the summons, addressed to individuals, to proclaim at the Arnon the calamity that has befallen the country to the north of that river. In vers. 21-24 the general idea of Moab's being laid waste is specialized by the enumeration of a long list of towns on which judgment has come. They are towns of **אֶרֶץ הַפִּישׁוֹר**, the table-land to the north of the Arnon, the names of which nearly all occur in the Pentateuch and Joshua as towns in the tribe of Reuben. But Holon is mentioned only here. According to Eusebius, in the *Onomasticon*, s.v. **Ιεσσά**, Jahzah was situated between **Μηδαβῶν** (*Medeba*) and **Δηβοῦς** (*Dibon*); according to Jerome, between *Medeba* and *Debus*, or *Deblathai*; but from Num. xxi. 23, we conclude that it lay in an easterly direction, on the border of the desert, near the commencement of the Wady Wale. Mophaath or Mephaath, where, according to the *Onomasticon*, a Roman garrison was placed, on account of the near proximity of the desert, is to be

sought for in the neighbourhood of Jahzah ; see on Josh. xiii. 18. As to Dibon, see on ver. 18 ; for Nebo, see on ver. 1. Beth-Diblathaim is mentioned only in this passage. It is probably identical with Almon-Diblathaim, Num. xxxiii. 46, and to be sought for somewhere north from Dibon. For Kirjathaim see ver. 1. Beth-Gamul is nowhere else mentioned ; its site, too, is unknown. Eli Smith, in Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. App. p. 153, is inclined to recognise it in the ruins of *Um-el-Jemel*, lying on the southern boundary of the Hauran, about twenty miles south-west from Bozrah ; but a consideration of the position shows that they cannot be the same. Beth-Meon, or Baal-Meon (Num. xxxii. 38), or more fully, Beth-Baal-Meon (Josh. xiii. 17), lay about three miles south from Heshbon, where Burckhardt (p. 365) found some ruins called *Mi-ân*, ميعن (Robinson, iii. App. p. 170, ماعين, *Ma-în*) ; see on Num. xxxii. 38. Kerioth, vers. 24 and 41, and Amos ii. 2, is not to be identified with the ruins called *Kereyath* or *Küreiyath*, mentioned by Burckhardt (p. 367) and Seetzen (*Reisen*, ii. 342, iv. 384), as Ritter has assumed ; for this Kereyath is more probably Kirjathaim (see on ver. 1). Rather, as is pretty fully proved by Dietrich (in *Merx' Archiv.* i. 320 ff.), it is a synonym of *Ar*, the old capital of Moab, Num. xxii. 36 ; and the plural form is to be accounted for by supposing that *Ar* was made up of two or several large portions. We find two great arguments supporting this position : (1.) When *Ar*, the capital, occurs among the names of the towns of Moab, as in the list of those in Reuben, Josh. xiii. 16–21, and in the prophecy against Moab in Isaiah, chap. xv. and xvi., where so many Moabitic towns are named, we find no mention of Kerioth ; and on the other hand, where Kerioth is named as an important town in Moab, Amos ii. 2, Jer. xlvi., there is no mention of *Ar*. (2.) Kerioth is mentioned as an important place in the country in Amos ii. 2, where, from the whole arrangement of the prophecy, it can only be the capital of Moab ; in this present chapter also, ver. 24, Kerioth and Bozrah are introduced as two very important towns which maintained the strength of Moab ; and immediately afterwards it is added, “ The horn of Moab is cut off,” etc. Further, in ver. 41 the capture of Kerioth is put on a level

with the taking of the fortresses ; while it is added, that the courage of the mighty men has failed, just as in xl ix. 22 the capture of Bozrah is coupled with the loss of courage on the part of Edom's heroes. Bozrah is not to be confounded with Bozrah in Edom (xl ix. 13), nor with the later flourishing city of Bostra in Hauran : it is the same with Bezer (בֶּזֶר), which, according to Deut. iv. 43 and Josh. xx. 8, was situated in the Mishor of the tribe of Reuben, but has not yet been discovered ; see on Deut. iv. 43. For the purpose of completing the enumeration, it is further added, “ all the towns of the land of Moab, those which are far off (*i.e.* those which are situated towards the frontier) and those which are near” (*i.e.* the towns of the interior, as Kimchi has already explained). Thereby the horn of Moab is cut off, and his arm broken. Horn and arm are figures of power : the horn an emblem of power that boldly asserts itself, and pushes down all that opposes (cf. Ps. lxxv. 5, 11) ; the arm being rather an emblem of dominion.

Vers. 26-35. *Moab's haughtiness and deplorable fall.*—Ver. 26. “ Make him drunk,—for he hath boasted against Jahveh,—so that Moab shall splash down into his vomit, and himself become a laughing-stock. Ver. 27. Was not Israel a laughing-stock to thee, or was he found among thieves ? for whenever thou spakest of him, thou didst shake thine head. Ver. 28. Leave the cities and dwell in the rock, ye inhabitants of Moab ; and be ye like a dove [that] builds its nest in the sides of the mouth of a pit. Ver. 29. We have heard the very arrogant pride of Moab, his haughtiness, and his arrogance, and his high-mindedness, and his elation of mind. Ver. 30. I know, saith Jahveh, his wrath, and the untruthfulness of his words ; they have done what is untrue. Ver. 31. Therefore will I howl over Moab, and for all Moab will I cry ; they mourn for the people of Kir-heres. Ver. 32. I will weep for thee [with more] than the weeping of Jazer, O vine of Sibmah, thou whose tendrils have gone over the sea, have reached even to the sea of Jazer ; on thy fruit-harvest and thy vintage a spoiler has fallen. Ver. 33. And joy and gladness are taken from the garden, and from the land of Moab ; and I have caused wine to fail from the wine-vats : they shall not tread [with] a shout ; the shout shall be no shout. Ver. 34. From the cry of Hesh-

bon as far as Elealeh, as far as Jahaz, they utter their voice ; from Zoar as far as Horonaim and the third Eglath ; for even the waters of Nimrim shall become desolations. Ver. 35. And I will destroy from Moab, saith Jahveh, him that offers on a high place and burns incense to his gods."

Through his pride, Moab has incurred the sentence of destruction to his power. In arrogance and rage he has exalted himself over Jahveh and His people Israel ; therefore must he now be humbled, vers. 26-30. The summons to make Moab drunk is addressed to those whom God has charged with the execution of the sentence ; cf. vers. 10 and 21. These are to present to the people of Moab the cup of the divine wrath, and so to intoxicate them, that they shall fall like a drunk man into his vomit, and become a laughing-stock to others (cf. xiii. 13, xxv. 15), because they have boasted against Jahveh by driving the Israelites from their inheritance, and by deriding the people of God ; cf. Zeph. ii. 8. **פָּפָּפָּ**, to strike, frequently of striking the hands together ; here it signifies to fall into his vomit, *i.e.* to tumble into it with a splash. No other explanation of the word can find support from the language used. Cf. Isa. xix. 14 and xxv. 10 f. In the last clause of ver. 26, the emphasis lies on **גַּם הָוֹא** : "he also (Moab, like Israel before) shall become a laughing-stock." This statement is enforced by the question put in ver. 27, "Was not Israel a laughing-stock to thee ?" **מָא—אָמָּן** shows a double question, like **מָא—הָנָּ** ; and **מָאָן** in the first clause may be further strengthened by the interrogative **הָ** before **שְׁחַק**, as in Gen. xvii. 17. For other forms of the double question, see Ps. xciv. 9, Job xxi. 4, Jer. xxiii. 26. On *Dagesh dirimens* in **שְׁחַקְתָּ**, cf. Ewald, § 104, b. There is no sufficient reason for questioning the feminine form **נְמַצְתָּה** in the *Qeri* ; Israel is personified as a woman, just as Moab in ver. 20, where **חַתָּה** is found. On **מְהִי דְּבִירִ בָּ**, cf. xxxi. 20, where, however, **דְּבִיר** **בָּ** is used in another meaning. **הַנִּיר בְּלָאֵשׁ**, to shake oneself, is a stronger expression than **הַתְּנִינָּר**, to shake the head (xviii. 16), a gesture denoting mockery and rejoicing over another's injury ; cf. Ps. lxiv. 9.—Ver. 28. A transition is now made from figurative to literal language, and Moab is summoned to leave the cities and take refuge in inaccessible rocks, because he will not be able to offer resistance to

the enemy ; cf. vers. 6 and 9. "Like a dove that builds its nest over deep crevices." The reference is to wild pigeons, which occur in large numbers in Palestine, and make their nests in the clefts of high rocks (Song of Sol. ii. 14) even at the present day, *e.g.* in the wilderness of Engedi ; cf. Robinson's *Palestine*, ii. 203. בָּעֵבֶר פִּי-פְּתַח, *lit.* "on the other side of the mouth of the deep pit," or of the abyss, *i.e.* over the yawning hollows. בָּעֵבֶר is a poetic form for בָּעֵבֶר, as in Isa. vii. 20. The humiliation of Moab finds its justification in what is brought out in ver. 29 f., his boundless pride and hatred against Israel.—Vers. 29 and 30 only more fully develope the idea contained in Isa. xvi. 6. Those who "heard" are the prophet and the people of God. There is an accumulation of words to describe the pride of Moab. Isaiah's expression also, עֲבָרֹתִי בְּרִי, is here expanded into two clauses, and Jahveh is named as the subject. Not only have the people of God perceived the pride of Moab, but God also knows his wrath. בְּרִי belongs to לֹא-כָּן as a genitive, as in Isaiah לֹא-כָּן means "not right," contrary to actual facts, *i.e.* untrue.¹—Vers. 31-33 are also an imitation of Isa. xvi. 7-10. Ver. 31 is a reproduction of Isa. xvi. 7. In ver. 7, Isaiah sets forth the lamentation of Moab over the devastation of his country and its precious fruits ; and not until ver. 9 does the prophet, in deep sympathy, mingle his tears with those of the Moabites. Jeremiah, on the other hand, with his natural softness, at once begins, in the first person, his lament over Moab. עַל-כֵּן, "therefore," is not immediately connected with ver. 29 f., but with the leading idea presented in vers. 26 and 28, that Moab will fall like one intoxicated, and that he must flee out of his cities. If we refer it to ver. 30, there we must attach it to the thought implicitly con-

¹ The Masoretic accentuation, according to which Athnach is placed under בְּרִי, exhibits another view of the words in the text : this is shown by the Chaldee paraphrase, "their nobles endure not, they have not done what is right." The Masoretes took בְּרִי in the sense of "staves," and took staves as a symbol of princes, as in Hos. xi. 6. Luther, in his translation, "I know his anger well, that he cannot do so very much, and attempts to do more than he can," follows the Vulgate, *Ego scio jactantiam ejus, et quod non sit juxta eam virtus ejus, nec juxta quod poterat conata sit facere*, which again seems to have followed the LXX. in taking בְּרִי for בְּרִי.

tained in the emphatic statement, "I (Jahveh) know his wrath," viz. "and I will punish him for it." The *I* who makes lament is the prophet, as in Isa. xvi. 9 and xv. 5. Schnurrer, Hitzig, and Graf, on the contrary, think that it is an indefinite third person who is introduced as representing the Moabites; but there is no analogous case to support this assumption, since the instances in which third persons are introduced are of a different kind. But when Graf further asserts, against referring the *I* to the prophet, that, according to what precedes, especially what we find in ver. 26 ff., such an outburst of sympathy for Moab would involve a contradiction, he makes out the prophet to be a Jew thirsting for revenge, which he was not. Raschi has already well remarked, on the other hand, under Isa. xv. 5, that "the prophets of Israel differ from heathen prophets like Balaam in this, that they lay to heart the distress which they announce to the nations;" cf. Isa. xxi. 3 f. The prophet weeps for all Moab, because the judgment is coming not merely on the northern portion (vers. 18–25), but on the whole of the country. In ver. 31b, Jeremiah has properly changed אֲנַשִׁים (cakes of dried grapes) into אֲנָשִׁים, the people of Kir-heres, because his sympathy was directed, not to dainties, but to the men in Moab; he has also omitted "surely they are smitten," as being too strong for his sympathy. יְהִנֵּה, to groan, taken from the cooing of doves, perhaps after Isa. xxxviii. 14, lxx. 11. The third person indicates a universal indefinite. Kir-heres, as in Isa. xvi. 11, or Kir-haresheth in Isa. xvi. 7, 2 Kings iii. 25, was the chief stronghold of Moab, probably the same as Kir-Moab, the modern Kerek, as we may certainly infer from a comparison of Isa. xvi. 7 with xv. 1; see on 2 Kings iii. 25, and Dietrich, S. 324.—Ver. 32. מִבְּכֵי יְעִיר, "more than the weeping of Jazer," may signify, "More than Jazer weeps do I weep over thee;" or, "More than over Jazer do I weep over thee." However, the former interpretation is the more obvious, and is confirmed by the reading in Isa. xvi. 9. According to the *Onomasticon*, Jazer was fifteen Roman miles north from Heshbon. Seetzen recognises it in the ruins called *es Szir* at the source of the *Nahr Szir*; see on Num. xxi. 32. According to Jerome, on Isa. xvi. 8, Sibmah was only five hundred paces from Heshbon; see on Num. xxxii. 38. Judging from the verse now

before us, and from Isa. *l.c.*, the vines of Sibmah must have been famed for the strength and excellence of their clusters. Even now, that region produces excellent grapes in abundance. From Szalt, which lies only ten miles north from Szir, raisins and grapes are carried to Jerusalem, and these of excellent quality (Seetzen, i. S. 399; Burckhardt, p. 350). In what follows, "his tendrils crossed the sea," etc., the extensive cultivation of the grape is set forth under the figure of a vine whose tendrils stretch out on all sides. "They have crossed over the sea" has reference in Isaiah (xvi. 8) to the Dead Sea (ם, as in Ps. lxviii. 23, 2 Chron. xx. 2); not merely, however, in the sense of the shoots reaching close to the Dead Sea, but also over it, for Engedi was famed for its vines (Cant. i. 14). Jeremiah also has reproduced the words taken from Isaiah in this sense. From the following clause, "they reached to the sea of Jazer," it does not follow that he has specified "the sea" by "Jazer." What tells rather the other way is the fact that עבר, which means to cross over, cannot possibly be used as equivalent to עַגְעַל, "to reach to." "They crossed over the sea" shows extension towards the west, while "they reached to the sea of Jazer" indicates extension towards the north. This latter statement also is an imitation of what we find in Isa. xvi. 8; and "Jazer" is merely further specified as "the sea of Jazer." In spite of the most diligent inquiries, Seetzen (i. S. 406) could learn nothing from the people of that region regarding an inland lake; but in the beautiful green vale in the vicinity of Szâr (*i.e.* Jazer) there were several ponds, which he supposes may possibly be the *mare Jazer*, since this valley lying among the mountains is somewhat depressed, and in ancient times was probably filled with water. The "sea" (ם) of Solomon's temple further shows that סִים does not necessarily denote only a large lake, but might also be applied to a large artificial basin of water. So also, at the present day, the artificial water-basins on the streets of Damascus are called *baharat*, "seas;" cf. Wetzstein in Delitzsch on Isa. xvi. 8. This cultivation of the vine is at an end; for the destroyer has fallen upon the fruit-harvest and the vintage. Jeremiah, by "the destroyer has fallen," explains the words of Isaiah (xvi. 9), "shouting has fallen."—In ver. 33, Isa. xvi. 10 is reproduced. "Joy and gladness are taken away from the gardens, and from

the whole land of Moab.” בְּרַמֵּל is not here a proper name, for Mount Carmel does not at all suit the present context; it is an appellative, fruit-land, *i.e.* the fruitful wine-country near Jazer. Jeremiah adds, “and from the land (*i.e.* the whole land) of Moab.” The pressing of the grapes comes to an end; there is no wine in the vat; no longer is the wine pressed with “Hedad.” הַיְדָה is an adverbial accusative. This is further specified by the oxymoron: a “Hedad, and yet not a Hedad.” This word generally signifies any loud shout,—not merely the shout of the wine-pressers as they tread the grapes (see on xxv. 30), but also a battle-cry; cf. li. 14. Hence the meaning is, “Hedad is heard, but not a merry shout of the wine-pressers.”—Ver. 34 is based on Isa. xv. 4–6. “From the cry of Heshbon is heard the echo as far as Elealeh and Jahaz,” or “from Heshbon to Elealeh and Jahaz is heard a cry, and from Zoar to Horonaim.” Heshbon and Elealeh are only about two miles distant from each other; their ruins are still visible under the names of *Hesbān* (*Husban*, see on ver. 2) and *El Al* (see on Num. xxxii. 37). They were both built on hills; Elealeh in particular was situated on the summit of a hill whence the whole of the southern Belka may be seen (Burckhardt, p. 365), so that a shout thence emitted could be heard at a great distance, even as far as Jahaz, which is pretty far off to the south-west from Heshbon (see on ver. 21). The words “from Zoar to Horonaim” also depend on “they uttered their voice.” Both places lay in the south of the land; see on vers. 3 and 4. The wailing resounds not merely on the north, but also on the south of the Arnon. There is much dispute as to the meaning of עַגְלַת שְׁלִשִּׁה, which is here mentioned after Horonaim, but in Isa. xv. 5 in connection with, or after Zoar. To take the expression as an appellative, *juvenca tertii anni* (LXX., Vulgate, Targum, Gesenius, etc.), would perhaps be suitable, if it were an apposition to Moab, in which case we might compare with it passages like xlvi. 20, l. 11; but this does not accord with its position after Horonaim and Zoar, for we have no analogy for the comparison of cities or fortresses with a *juvenca tertii anni*, *h. e. indomita jugoque non assueta*; and it cannot even be proved that Zoar and Horonaim were fortresses of Moab. Hence we take עַגְלַת שְׁלִשִּׁה as the proper name of a place, “the third Eglath;” this is the view of Rosenmüller,

Drechsler, and Dietrich (in *Merx's Archiv.* i. S. 342 ff.). The main reason for this view is, that there would be no use for an addition being made, by way of apposition, to a place which is mentioned as the limit of the Moabites' flight, or that reached by their wailing. The parallelism of the clauses argues in favour of its being a proper name; for, on this view of it, three towns are named in both members, the first once, as the starting-point of the cry of wailing, the other two as points up to which it is heard. The preposition **עַ**, which is omitted, may be supplied from the parallel member, as in Isa. xv. 8. Regarding the position of *Eglath Shelishijah*, it is evident from the context of both passages that we must look for it on the southern frontier of Moab. It is implied in the epithet "the third" that there were three places (villages), not far from one another, all bearing the same name. Dietrich (S. 344 f.) has adduced several analogous cases of towns in the country to the east of the Jordan,—two, and sometimes even three, towns of the same name, which are distinguished from each other by numerals. "The waters of Nimrim also shall become desolations," because the enemy fill up the springs with earth. Nimrim is not the place called נִמְרָה or **בֵּית נִמְרָה** mentioned in Num. xxxii. 3, 36, Josh. xiii. 27, whose ruins lie on the way from Szalt to Jericho, in the Wady Shaib, on the east side of the Jordan (see on Num. xxxii. 36), for this lies much too far to the north to be the place mentioned here. The context points to a place in the south, in Moab proper, where Burckhardt (p. 355), Seetzen (*Reisen*, ii. S. 354), and de Saulcy (*Voyage*, i. 283, ii. 52) have indicated a stream fed by a spring, called *Moiet Numére* (*i.e.* brook Nimrah), in the country at the south end of the Dead Sea, and in that wady a mass of ruins called *Numére* (the *Nimmery* of Seetzen, iii. 18).—Ver. 35 ends the strophe of which it is a part; here the Lord declares that He will make to cease לְמוֹאָב (for, or from Moab, lit. to Moab), every one who offers on a high place and burns incense to his gods. מִעְלָה cannot be a substantive, else the parallelism would be destroyed. Nor may we, with Hitzig, render "he who raises a high place," *i.e.* builds it, for העַלְהָ is not used in this sense.

Vers. 36-38. *Further lamentation over the fall of Moab.*—Ver. 36. "Therefore my heart sounds like pipes for Moab, and

my heart sounds like pipes for the men of Kir-heres ; therefore the savings which he has made are perished. Ver. 37. For every head is baldness, and every beard is shorn ; on all hands there are cuts, and on loins sackcloth. Ver. 38. On all the roofs of Moab, and in its streets, it is all mourning ; for I have broken Moab like a vessel, in which there is no pleasure, saith Jahveh."

The prophet once more lifts up his lamentation over Moab (ver. 36 corresponds to ver. 31), and gives reason for it in the picture he draws of the deep affliction of the Moabites. Ver. 36a is an imitation of Isa. xvi. 11 ; the thought presented in ver. 36b accords with that found in Isa. xv. 7. Isaiah says, " My bowels sound (groan) like the harp," whose strings give a tremulous sound when struck with the plectrum. Instead of this, Jeremiah puts the sounding of pipes, the instruments used in dirges (Matt. ix. 23). Moab and Kir-heres are mentioned together, as in ver. 31. עַל־בָּן, in the second clause, does not stand for בְּנֵי עַל, "on this account that" (Kimchi, Hitzig, Graf, etc.), but is co-ordinated with the first עַל־בָּן. The idea is not, "Therefore my heart mourns over Moab, because the savings are perished ;" but because the sentence of desolation has been passed on the whole of Moab, therefore the heart of the prophet makes lament, and therefore, too, all the property which Moab has acquired is lost. קָרְחָה, as a collective noun, is joined with the plural verb בָּבָדָא. On the construction יִתְהַרְתָּ עַל־בָּן, cf. Gesenius, § 123, 3, Rem. 1 ; Ewald, § 332, c. The proof of this is given by the deep sorrow and wailing of the whole Moabite nation, ver. 37 f. On all sides are tokens of the deepest sadness,—heads shorn bald, beards cut off, incisions on the hands, sackcloth round the loins.—Ver. 37 is formed out of pieces taken from Isa. xv. 2, 3. קָרְחָה is a substantive, "baldness," i.e. quite bald. בְּרוּעָה, *decurtata*, instead of בְּרוּעָה (in Isaiah), is weaker, but more suitable for the present connection. קָרְבָּה, i.e. cuts or scratches inflicted on the body, as signs of mourning ; cf. xvi. 6, xli. 5. בָּלָה מְסֻפֶּר, "It is all wailing ;" nothing is heard but wailing, for God has broken Moab in pieces like a useless vessel. On the simile employed, cf. xxii. 28.

Vers. 39–44. *No escape from destruction.*—Ver. 39. " How it is broken ! they howl. How hath Moab turned the back, for shame ! And Moab becomes a laughing-stock and a terror

to all his neighbours. Ver. 40. For thus saith Jahveh: Behold, he shall fly like the eagle, and spread his wings over Moab. Ver. 41. Kerioth is taken, and the strongholds are seized, and the heart of the heroes of Moab on that day become like the heart of a travailing woman. Ver. 42. And Moab is destroyed from being a people, because he hath boasted against Jahveh. Ver. 43. Fear, and a pit, and a snare, are against thee, O inhabitant of Moab, saith Jahveh. Ver. 44. He who flees from the fear shall fall into the pit, and he who goes up out of the pit shall be taken in the snare; for I will bring against it, against Moab, the year of their recompense, saith Jahveh."

The subject of מִתְּחִתָּה in ver. 39 is Moab viewed as a nation. מִלְּאָלָה might be imperative, but in this case we would be obliged to take בְּזַעַף also as an imperative (as Hitzig and Graf do). It is simpler to take both forms as perfects: "they howl . . . Moab turns the back, is ashamed" (= for shame). On תְּהִתְּשַׁקְּלָה, cf. ver. 26. מִתְּחִתָּה, object of terror, as in xvii. 17. "All who are round about him," as in ver. 17. "For (ver. 40) the enemy rushes down upon Moab like an eagle, and seizes Kerioth and all his strongholds." The subject is left unnamed, as in xlvi. 18, but it is Nebuchadnezzar. The figure of the eagle, darting down in flight on its prey, is founded on Deut. xxviii. 49 (on אָלָה for אֵל, cf. xlxi. 22). Kerioth, the capital, is taken (see on ver. 24); so are the other strongholds or fastnesses of the country. The mere fact that קָרִיּוֹת has the article does not justify any one in taking it as an appellative, "the cities;" this appears from a comparison of Amos ii. 2 with this verse. No plural of קָרִיה occurs anywhere. Then the fear of death falls on the heroes of Moab like a woman in labour. מִצְרָה, partic. Hiphil from צָרָר, *uterum comprimens*, is found only here and in xlxi. 22, where the figure is repeated. Moab is annihilated, so that it is no longer a nation (cf. ver. 2), because it has risen up in pride against the God of Israel; cf. ver. 26. He who flees from one danger falls into the other. The play on the words פִּתְּרָה, fear, horror, פִּתְּחָה, pit, and פִּתְּחָה, spring-trap, as well as the mode in which it is carried out, is taken from Isa. xxiv. 17 f.,—a prophecy of the judgment on the world; see a similar idea presented in Amos v. 19, but somewhat differently expressed. The *Kethib* הַנִּים, perfect Hiphil, "he flees," is less suit-

able than the *Qeri* חֶסֶף (after Isaiah). The last clause, “for I will bring,” etc., is quite in Jeremiah’s peculiar style; cf. iv. 23, xxiii. 12. אֲלֵיכֶם belongs to מִזְמָרָב אֶלְךָ: the noun is anticipated by the pronoun, as frequently occurs; cf. ix. 14, xli. 3, xlvi. 11.

Vers. 45-47. Conclusion.—Ver. 45. “Under the shadow of Heshbon stand fugitives, powerless; for a fire goes out from Heshbon, and a flame from Sihon, and devours the region of Moab, and the crown of the head of the sons of tumult. Ver. 46. Woe unto thee, Moab! the people of Chemosh are perished! for thy sons are taken away into captivity, and thy daughters into captivity. Ver. 47. Yet will I turn the captivity of Moab at the end of the days, saith Jahveh. Thus far is the judgment of Moab.”

From Heshbon issued the resolution to annihilate Moab (ver. 2); to Heshbon the prophecy finally returns. “In the shadow of Heshbon stand fugitives, powerless” (מִבְּנֵי, with בְּ privative), where, no doubt, they were seeking refuge; cf. Isa. xxx. 2, 3. The fugitives can only be Moabites. Here it is astonishing that they seek refuge in Heshbon, since the enemy comes from the north, and according to ver. 2, it is in Heshbon that the resolution to destroy Moab was formed; and judging from xlvi. 3, that city was then in the hands of the Ammonites. Hence Hitzig and Graf miss the connection. Hitzig thinks that the whole clause was inserted by a glosser, who imagined the town belonged to Moab, perhaps allowing himself to be misled in this by Num. xxi. 27, “Come to Heshbon.” Graf, on the other hand, is of opinion that the fugitives are seeking the protection of the Ammonites in Heshbon, but do not find it: hence he would take the וְ which follows in the adversative sense of “however” or “rather;” but this is against the use of the word, and cannot be allowed. The tenor of the words, “Fugitives stand under the shadow of Heshbon,” does not require us to assume that people had fled to Heshbon out of the whole of Moab. Let us rather think of fugitives from the environs of Heshbon, who seek refuge in this fortified town, from the enemy advancing from the north, but who find themselves disappointed in their expectation, because from this city there bursts forth the fire of war which destroys Moab. The thought merely serves the purpose

of attaching to it the utterances which follow regarding Moab; but from vers. 43 and 44 alone, it is evident that escape will be impossible. In proof of this he mentions the flight to Heshbon, that he may have an opportunity of introducing a portion of the old triumphal songs of the Mosaic age, with which he wished to conclude his prophecy, vers. 45b and 46. The fugitives stand powerless, *i.e.* exhausted and unable to flee any further, while Heshbon affords them no refuge. For there bursts forth from it the fire that is to destroy the whole of Moab. The words from "for a fire," etc., on to the end of ver. 46, are a free imitation of some strophes out of an ancient song, in which poets of the Mosaic period celebrated the victory of Israel over Sihon the king of the Amorites, who had conquered the greater portion of Moab; but with this there is interwoven a passage from the utterances of Balaam the seer, regarding the fall of Moab, found in Num. xxiv. 17, viz. from בְּנֵי שָׁאוֹן וַתִּאָכַל to בְּנֵי שָׁאוֹן. These insertions are made for the purpose of showing that, through this judgment which is now coming upon Moab, not only those ancient sayings, but also the prophecy of Balaam, will find their full accomplishment. Just as in the time of Moses, so now also there again proceeds from Heshbon the fire of war which will consume Moab. The words, "for a fire has gone out from Heshbon," are a verbatim repetition of what we find in Num. xxi. 28, with the single exception that שׁ is here, as in Ps. civ. 4, construed as masculine, and thus takes נָאָר instead of יִצְאָה; but this change, of course, does not affect the meaning of the words. The next clause runs, in Numbers, *i.e.*, לְהַבָּה מִבֵּין סִיחוֹן, but here לְהַבָּה מִבֵּין סִיחוֹן; this change into מִבֵּין is difficult to account for, so that J. D. Michaelis and Ewald would alter it into מִבֵּית. There is no need for refuting the assumption of Raschi and Nägelsbach, that Sihon stands for the city of Sihon; or the fancy of Morus and Hitzig, that an old glosser imagined Sihon was a town instead of a king. When we consider that the burning of Heshbon by the Israelites, celebrated in that ancient song, was brought on by Sihon the Amorite king, since the Israelites were not to make war on Moab, and only fought against Sihon, who had made Heshbon his residence, there can be no doubt that Jeremiah purposely changed מִבֵּין סִיחוֹן into מִקְרִית, in order to show that Sihon was

the originator of the fire which consumed Heshbon. By this latter expression Jeremiah seeks to intimate that, in Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldean army, there will arise against the Moabites another Sihon, from whose legions will burst forth the flame that is to consume Moab. מִבּּין, “from between,” is to be explained on the ground that Sihon is not viewed as a single individual, but as the leader of martial hosts. This fire will “devour the region of Moab, and the crown of the head of the sons of tumult.” These words have been taken by Jeremiah from Balaam’s utterance regarding Moab, Num. xxiv. 17, and embodied in his address after some transformation. What Balaam announces regarding the ruler (Star and Sceptre) that is to arise out of Israel, viz. “he shall smite the region of Moab, and dash in pieces the sons of tumult,” Jeremiah has transferred to the fire; accordingly, he has changed וְקָרְבָּן-בְּנֵי-שִׁיחָת into וְקָרְבָּן, and וְקָרְבָּן into וְקָרְבָּן. Several commentators understand פְּאַתָּה as signifying the margin of the beard (Lev. xix. 27, xxi. 5); but the mention of the crown of the head in the parallel member does not require this meaning, for פְּאַתָּה does not signify the corner of the beard, except when found in combination with רָאשׁ or קְרֵנָה. The singeing of the margin of the beard seems, in connection with the burning of the crown, too paltry and insignificant. As in the fundamental passage פְּאַתָּה signify the sides of Moab, so here פְּאַתָּה is the side of the body, and קָרְבָּן the head. קָרְבָּן, *homines tumultuosi*, are the Moabites with their imperious disposition; cf. ver. 29.—Ver. 46 is again derived from the ancient poem in Num. xxi., but the second half of the verse is altered. The bold figure which represents Chemosh the god of the Moabites as delivering his people up to captivity, is continued in the literal statement of the case; Moab’s sons and daughters, *i.e.* its population, are carried away by the enemy into captivity.—Ver. 47. This infliction of judgment, however, on the Moabites, is not to prove a complete annihilation of them. At the end of the days, *i.e.* in the Messianic times (see on xxiii. 20), there is in store for them a turn in their fortunes, or a restoration. For שׁׁוב שְׁבּוֹת, see on xxix. 14. Cf. the similar promise for Egypt, xlvi. 26; Ammon and Elam, xlvi. 6 and 39. The last clause, “Thus far,” etc.,

is an addition made by the editor, when this oracle was received into the collection of Jeremiah's prophecies; cf. li. 64. מִזְמָרָה means the prophecy regarding Moab with respect to its contents.

As to the fulfilment of the threatened ruin, Josephus (*Antt.* x. 9. 7) states that Nebuchadnezzar, in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, made war on the Moabites and subdued them. This statement is not to be questioned, though the date given should be incorrect. We have no other sources of information regarding this people. After the return of the Israelites from Babylon, the Moabites are no longer mentioned as a people, except in Ezra ix. 1, Neh. xiii. 1, 23, where it is stated that some Israelites had married Moabitish wives; nor is any mention made of this people in the books of the Maccabees, which, however, relate the wars of Judas Maccabeus with the Ammonites and Edomites (1 Macc. v. 3 and 6, cf. iv. 61); neither is there any further notice taken of them in Josephus, who only now and then speaks of Moab, *i.e.* the country and its towns (*Antt.* xiii. 14. 2, 15. 4; *Bell. Jud.* iii. 3. 3, iv. 8. 2). This name seems to have been merged, after the exile, in that of the Arabians. But the disappearance of the name of this people does not exclude the probability that descendants continued to exist, who, when Christianity spread in the country to the east of the Jordan, were received into the communion of the Christian church.

Chap. xlix. *Concerning Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Kedar and Hazor, Elam.*

Vers. 1-6. CONCERNING THE CHILDREN OF AMMON.—The Ammonites were, not merely as regards descent, but also as to their character and their relation to Israel, the twin-people with the Moabites. From them, too, as well as from the Moabites, Sihon the king of the Ammonites had wrenched a portion of their territory, which the Israelites received for a possession after Sihon had been subdued. This territory they sought every opportunity of retaking from the Israelites, whom they as constantly endeavoured to humiliate when they could. Besides their connection with Eglon the Moabite king (*Judg.* iii. 13), they oppressed Israel during the period of the judges for

eighteen years, not only in Gilead, but also on this side of Jordan, since they fought against Ephraim, Benjamin, and Judah (Judg. x. 7 ff., xi. 12-32). During Samuel's time, their king Nahash besieged Jabesh-Gilead, and demanded the surrender of the city under shameful conditions, in consequence of which they were defeated by Saul (1 Sam. ii.). During the time of David they disgracefully treated his ambassadors, who had come to comfort King Hanun over the death of his father; they then united with the Syrians against Israel, but were defeated by Joab, and, after the taking of their capital, Rabbah, severely chastised (2 Sam. x. 1 to xi. 1, and xii. 26-31). Under the reign of Jehoshaphat, also, in company with the Moabites, they invaded Judah (2 Chron. xx.); and when, later, the Israelites were heavily oppressed by the Syrians under Hazael, the Ammonites practised cruelties on them in Gilead, for which the prophet Amos (i. 13-15) threatens them with devastation of their country and foreign captivity. After the death of Jeroboam II., who had restored the borders of Israel as far as the Dead Sea (2 Kings xiv. 25), the Ammonites must have made fresh attempts to enlarge their territory during the interregnum that had begun in the kingdom of the ten tribes; for it is mentioned in 2 Chron. xxvi. 8 that they brought presents to King Uzziah, *i.e.* paid tribute, and had thus been rendered tributary to him: it is also stated in 2 Chron. xxvii. 5 that his son Jotham marched against them in order to enforce the payment of the tribute. But when, soon afterwards, Tiglath-pileser the Assyrian carried away the tribes of Israel on the east of the Jordan (2 Kings xv. 29; 1 Chron. v. 26), the Ammonites seized possession of the depopulated country of the tribes of Gad and Reuben, while they also seized Heshbon on the border of these two tribal territories. This unjust appropriation of Israelitish territory forms the starting-point of the prophecy now before us.

Ammon has taken possession of the inheritance of Gad, therefore must his cities be destroyed by war, that Israel may again obtain his own property (vers. 1, 2). Ammon will sorrow deeply, for his god will go with his princes into captivity (vers. 2-4). His trust in the wealth of his land will not help him, but his people will be frightened away through terror on every side, yet they will be restored in the future (vers. 5, 6).

Ver. 1. "Concerning the children of Ammon, thus saith Jahveh: Hath Israel no sons, or hath he no heir? Why doth their king inherit Gad, and his people dwell in his cities? Ver. 2. Therefore, behold, days are coming, saith Jahveh, when I will cause to be heard against Rabbah of the children of Ammon a war-cry; and it shall become a heap of ruins, and her daughters shall be burned with fire: and Israel shall heir those who heired him, saith Jahveh. Ver. 3. Howl, O Hesh-bon! for Ai is laid waste. Cry! ye daughters of Rabbah, gird yourselves with sackcloth; lament, and run up and down among the enclosures: for their king shall go into captivity, his priests and his princes together. Ver. 4. Why dost thou glory in the valleys? Thy valley flows away, O thou rebellious daughter, that trusted in her treasures, [saying], Who shall come to me? Ver. 5. Behold, I will bring a fear upon thee, saith the Lord Jahveh of hosts, from all that is round thee; and ye shall be driven each one before him, and there shall be none to gather together the fugitives. Ver. 6. But afterwards I will turn the captivity of the children of Ammon, saith Jahveh."

The address begins with a question full of reproach: "Has Israel, then, no sons who could take possession of his land as their inheritance, that the king of the Ammonites has taken possession of Gad (*i.e.* of the hereditary portion of the tribe of Gad), and dwells in the cities of Gad?" The question presupposes that the Israelites had been carried away by Tiglath-pileser, but at the same time, also, that the country still belongs to the Gadites, for they certainly have sons who shall again receive the inheritance of their fathers. Since Jeremiah, as is clear from ver. 3, had Amos i. 13-15 in his mind, he evidently uses מלֶכֶם in a double sense, not merely in ver. 3, but even in ver. 1 also, with a reference to Amos i. 15, meaning the king and god of the Ammonites. As in Amos, Aquila, Symmachus, Jerome, and the Syriac, so in this passage also, the LXX., Vulgate, and Syriac have understood מלֶכֶם of the god מלֶכֶם; with them agree Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf. But the reasons alleged for the change of מלֶכֶם into מלֶכּוּם are quite as insufficient here as in Amos i. 15. Just as, in the last-named passage, מלֶכֶם first of all refers to the king of the Ammonites, so is it here. It is not the god, but the king, of the Ammonites

that has taken possession of the territory of Gad. It is not till ver. 3 that the reference to the god Milcom plainly comes out. Ver. 2. Therefore shall Rabbah, the capital of the Ammonites, hear the cry of war, and be changed into a heap of ruins. רְבָתָה גְּדוּלָה עַבְדָּה, “The great (city) of the sons of Ammon,” is the full name of the Ammonite capital (cf. Deut. iii. 11), which is usually called, briefly, רְבָתָה (Amos i. 14; 2 Sam. xi. 1, etc.); it was afterwards called *Philadelphia*, probably after Ptolemy *Philadelphus*, in Polybius ‘*Paββατάμανα*, in Abulfeda *Amān*, which is the name still given to its ruins on the Nahr Ammān, *i.e.* the Upper Jabbok; see on Deut. iii. 11. “A cry of war,” as in iv. 19; cf. Amos i. 14. “A hill of desolation,” *i.e.* a heap of ruins; cf. Josh. viii. 28, Deut. xiii. 17. “Her daughters” are the smaller cities dependent on the capital,—here, all the remaining cities of the Ammonites; cf. Num. xxi. 25, Josh. xv. 45, etc. “Israel shall heir those who heired him,” *i.e.* receive back the property of those who have appropriated his land.—Ver. 3. The cities of the Ammonites, *i.e.* their inhabitants, shall howl and lament over this calamity. The summons given to Heshbon to howl implies that this city, formerly the residence of Sihon, was then in possession of the Ammonites. There is obscurity in the clause announcing the reason, “for עַבְדָּה (LXX. *Tai'*) is laid waste:” the word seems to be a proper noun, but there is no city of this name known in the Ammonite country, or the land east of the Jordan; while we must not think of Ai (עַי, Josh. vii. 2 f.), which was situated on the west side of the Jordan. Venema and Ewald are inclined to take the word as an appellative, synonymous with לְהַרְחֵב, “ruins” (which is the meaning of עַבְדָּה), and regard it as the subject of Rabbah, the capital, “because it has been laid in ruins.” But a comparison of xlvi. 20, iv. 20, Zech. xi. 3, rather favours our taking עַבְדָּה as the subject. Graf and others would therefore change עַבְדָּה into עַי, as (they say) the capital of the Ammonites was called by the Israelites. But there are no historical traces of this designation of Rabbah. There remains hardly any other course open than to consider עַבְדָּה as the name of an important Ammonite city. The mere fact that it is mentioned nowhere else cannot form a strong foundation for the objection against this assumption, for we do not find anywhere a list of the Ammonite cities. The

inhabitants of the other towns are to put on signs of sorrow, and go about mourning “in the enclosures,” *i.e.* in the open country, since the cities, being reduced to ashes, no longer afford shelter. Most expositors understand בְּדָרוֹת as meaning sheep-folds (Num. xxxii. 16, 24, 36); but there is no reason for taking this special view of the meaning of the word, according to which בְּדָרוֹת would stand for בְּדָרָה. בְּדָרָה and בְּדָרָה also mean the wall of a vineyard, or the hedges of the vineyards, and in Num. xxii. 24 specially the enclosure of the vineyards at the cross-roads in the country east of the Jordan. This is the meaning here. We must not, with Nägelsbach, think of city walls on which one could run up and down, for the purpose of taking measures for defence: the words do not signify the walls of a city. The carrying away into exile of *Malcam* with his priests and princes gives the reason for the sorrow. מלְכָם is here not the earthly king, but the god *Milcom* viewed as the king of the Ammonites, as is clear from the addition, בְּהַנִּי, and from the parallel passage in xlviii. 7. The clause is copied from Amos i. 15, but has been substituted for בְּהַנִּי, in order that may be understood of *Milcom*, the chief deity (see on 1 Kings xi. 5).—Ver. 4. Thus shall the empty boasting of the Ammonites and their trust in their riches come to nothing. “Why dost thou boast of the valleys?” *i.e.* of the splendid fruitful valleys and plains which, being well watered, produced large crops of corn and wheat.¹ זֶב עַמְקָה is viewed by some as an antithesis [to what immediately precedes]: “thy valley flows, *se.* with the blood of the slain” (Rosenmüller and Gesenius still view it thus); or, “it flows away,” *i.e.* thy valley (viz. its inhabitants) is scattered, dispersed. But it is quite arbitrary to supply “with blood;” and even the other explanation—which Hitzig justifies on the ground that valley or river-bottom stands for what it contains,

¹ The LXX. have in this passage, as in xlvii. 5, changed עַמְקָה for עַמְקָה, and translated τὸν στρατηγὸν τοῖς πεδίοις Ευνανεῖμ; here it remains doubtful whether they have expressed בְּעַמְקִים or בְּעַמְקָה by 'Ευνανεῖμ. On the ground of this arbitrary paraphrase, Hitzig would at once change עַמְקִים into עַמְקָה, without considering that the giant races of that region, to which Og the king of Bashan had also belonged (Dcut. iii. 11), were not called עַמְקִים at all, but בְּעַמְקִים by the Ammonites, and by the Moabites (Deut. ii. 10, 20).

i.e. the inhabitants of the valley, and that the population is represented under the figure of a mass of water running, flowing away—is very far-fetched. The words cannot form an antithesis to what precedes (because the description of the confidence shown is still continued, and the antithesis does not follow till ver. 5), but merely a further extension of the preceding clause. We may, then, either translate, “thy valley flows, overflows,” so that the words shall be subordinated to what precedes; or we may take בָּבָר, with Ewald and Graf, as a noun, in which case we must repeat the preposition בְּ, “the abundance of thy valley.” The singular, “thy valley,” means, together with the other valleys of the country, perhaps the valley of Rabbah; for Ammân lies in a broad valley along the banks of the Moiet Ammân, which has its source in a pool two hundred paces from the south-west end of the city (Burckhardt's *Syria*, p. 355). Regarding the vicinity, Abulfeda writes (*Tabulae Syri*. ed. Mich. p. 92), *circumjecta regio arva sativa sunt ac terra bona et abundans*. The direct address, “O rebellious daughter,” used of Israel in xxxi. 22, is here transferred to the inhabitants of Rabbah, with reference to the fact that the Ammonites, denying their descent from Lot, behaved like enemies towards Jahveh and His people. In trusting their riches, they are like the Moabites, xlvi. 7. In this confidence they said, “Who will come unto us?” i.e. attack us as enemies. Thereupon the Lord replies, “I will bring on thee fear, terror from all that is round thee,” all the nations that dwell about thee (cf. xlvi. 17, 39), whose distress or overthrow will put thee in terror. לְפָנָיו = אִישׁ נָגֵן, “every one before him” (cf. Josh. vi. 5, Amos iv. 3), without looking about him, or turning round (cf. xlvi. 5), i.e. in the most precipitate flight, with no one to rally the fugitives. לְפָנָר is collective.—Ver. 6. Yet afterwards, the fortunes of Ammon also shall be changed, as it was with Moab, xlvi. 47.

Regarding the fulfilment of this prophecy (just as in the case of Moab), we have no further information than that of Josephus (*Ant.* x. 9. 7), that Nebuchadnezzar defeated and subdued the Ammonites in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem. Shortly before, their king Baalis had got Gedaliah the governor put out of the way (Jer. xl. 14). Even

after the exile they kept up their hostile spirit against the Israelites and the Jews, inasmuch as they tried to hinder the building of the city walls at Jerusalem (Neh. iv. 1 ff.), and in the Maccabean age were still making war against the Jews; 1 Macc. v. 6, 30-43. Their name was preserved till the time of Justin Martyr (*Αμμανιτῶν ἐστιν νῦν πολὺ πλῆθος*, *Dial. Tryph.* p. 272). But Origen already comprehends their country under the general name Arabia (*lib. 1 in Jobum*).

Vers. 7-22. CONCERNING EDOM.—To the Edomites, whom Israel were to leave undisturbed in their possession, since they were a kindred nation (Deut. ii. 4), Balaam announces that “Edom shall become a possession,” *i.e.* shall be taken possession of by the ruler rising out of Israel. We have shown, in the explanation given of Num. xxiv. 18, that up to the time of the exile this utterance had been fulfilled merely by feeble attacks being made, since the Edomites were only temporarily subdued by the Israelites, then soon made themselves independent again, and made war on Israel. On account of their implacable hostility towards the people of God, Ezekiel (xxv. 12 ff.), as well as Jeremiah in this prophecy, announces ruin to them. The contents of the prophecy before us are as follow: The far-famed wisdom of Teman will not preserve Edom from the destruction with which Jahveh will visit it. The judgment of desolation that has been decreed shall inevitably come on it (vers. 7-13). The nations shall wage war against it, and make it small; because of its proud trust in the strength of its dwelling-place, it shall become the laughing-stock of every passer-by (vers. 14-18). As a lion from the reedy places of Jordan suddenly attacks a herd, the Lord will drag the Edomites from their rocky dwelling, so that the earth shall quake with the crash of their fall, and the anguish of death shall seize their heroes (vers. 19-22). In this prophecy Jeremiah has relied much on Obadiah, vers. 1-9, and reproduced much of his expressions regarding the fall of Edom.¹ According to what has been said, his address falls into three strophes. In the first (vers. 7-13), the judgment breaking

¹ The use made of Obadiah by Jeremiah has been so convincingly proved, especially by Caspary in his commentary on Obadiah, that even Ewald and Graf, who place the prophecy of Obadiah in the time of the

over Edom is depicted as one that cannot be averted, and as having been irrevocably decreed by the Lord; in the second (vers. 14-18), it is set forth as to its nature and the occasion of its occurrence; and in the third (vers. 19-22), as to its completion and consequences.

Vers. 7-13. *The judgment as inevitable.*—Ver. 7. “Thus saith Jahveh of hosts: Is there no more wisdom in Teman? has wisdom perished from those of understanding? is their wisdom [all] poured out? Ver. 8. Flee, turn ye! hide yourselves, ye inhabitants of Dedan; for I bring the destruction of Esau upon him, the time [when] I visit him. Ver. 9. If grape-gatherers come to thee, they will not leave gleanings; if thieves by night, they destroy what suffices them. Ver. 10. For I have stripped Esau, I have uncovered his secret places, and he cannot cover himself; his seed is destroyed, and his brethren, and his neighbours, and he is not. Ver. 11. Leave thine orphans, I will keep them alive; and let thy widows trust me. Ver. 12. For thus saith Jahveh: Behold, [they] whose judgment was not to drink the cup shall certainly drink it: and art thou he [who] shall be quite unpunished? thou shalt not be unpunished, but shalt certainly drink. Ver. 13. For by myself have I sworn, saith Jahveh, that Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste, and a curse; and all its cities shall become everlasting wastes.”

In order to frighten Edom out of his carnal security, the prophet begins by depicting the horror of the judgment coming down on this people, before which his wise men shall stand not knowing what to advise, and unable to find out any means for averting the evil. *Teman*, the home of the wise Eliphaz (Job ii. 11), is here, as in Amos i. 12, Obad. ver. 9, the region of that name in Gebalene, the northern district of Idumea; see on Amos i. 12. The question, “Is there no longer wisdom in Teman?” is ironical, and has a negative meaning. The following clauses also are to be taken as questions, not as assent to the question, as Hitzig and Graf infer from the omission of בָנִים. בָנִים is not the plural of בָן, “son,” but the participle of בָן or

exile, acknowledge this use that has been made of it, and therefore hold that the first part of the book of Obadiah is a fragment of an older oracle. This is a hypothesis which we have already shown, in the introduction to Obadiah, to be untenable.

בָּנִים, and equivalent to ; cf. Isa. xxix. 14.—Ver. 8. The Dedanites, whose caravans march in peace through Edom (see on xxv. 23), must flee, and hide themselves in deeply concealed hiding-places, in order to escape the evil befalling Edom. The form חָפְנִי, which only occurs besides in Ezek. ix. 2, in the sense of being “turned, directed,” is here preferred to the Hiphil (cf. ver. 24, xlvi. 21, etc.), in order to indicate the constraint under which they must change their route. העמִיקִי is also an imperative, in spite of the Segol in the first syllable, which is found there, in some forms, instead of *a*; cf. Ewald, § 226, *a*. העמִיקִי לְשַׁבָּת, “make deep to stay,” *i.e.* withdraw yourselves into deep or hidden places, where the enemy does not see and discover you. “For the destruction of Esau,” *i.e.* the destruction determined on Esau, or Edom, “I bring on him;” on this matter, cf. xlvi. 21.—Ver. 9 is a reproduction of Obad. ver. 5, but in such a way that what Obadiah brings forward as a comparison is directly applied by Jeremiah to the enemy: our prophet represents the enemy as grape-gatherers who leave nothing to glean, and as nocturnal thieves who destroy what is sufficient for them, *i.e.* destroy till they have enough, drag away and destroy as much as they can. The after-clauses, “they will not leave,” etc., “they destroy,” etc., are thus not to be taken as questions. The reference to Obadiah does not entitle us to supply תְּלֹוֹן from that passage. The connection here is somewhat different. The following verse is joined by means of בַּי, “for;” and the thought, “for I have stripped Esau, I have discovered his secret places,” shows that the enemy is to be understood by the grape-gatherers and nocturnal thieves: he will leave nothing to glean—will plunder all the goods and treasures of Edom, even those that have been hidden. On this subject, cf. Obad. ver. 6. שְׁלַח, “to strip off leaves, make bare” (xiii. 26), has been chosen with a regard to נְחַפֵּשׁ in Obadiah. וּנְחַפֵּשׁ לֹא יִכְלֶל, *lit.* “and he hides himself, he will not be able to do it;” *i.e.* Esau (Edom) tries to hide himself; he will not be able to do it—he will not remain concealed from the enemy. There are not sufficient grounds for changing the perf. נְחַפֵּא—נְחַפֵּה into the inf. abs. נְחַפֵּה, as Ewald and Graf do. “His seed is destroyed,” *i.e.* his family, the posterity of Esau, the Edomites.

“his brethren,” the descendants of nations related to the family, and of others similar who had intermingled with them, as the Amalekites, Gen. xxxvi. 12, Horites, Gen. xxxvi. 20 ff., Simeonites, 1 Chron. iv. 42, “and his neighbours,” the neighbouring tribes, as Dedan, ver. 8, Thema and Buz, xxv. 23. “And he is not” is added to give intensity, as in Isa. xix. 7; cf. Jer. xxxi. 15. The last idea is made more intensive by ver. 11, “Leave your orphans and widows.” Edom is addressed, and the imperative expresses what must happen. The men of Edom will be obliged to leave their wives and children, and these will be left behind as widows and orphans, because the men fall in battle. Yet the Lord will care for them, so that they shall not perish. In this comfort there is contained a very bitter truth for the Edomites who hated Jahveh. **לְבָבֶךָ** is the imperative (Ewald, § 228, *a*), not infinitive (Hitzig); and **לְבָבֶךָ** is a rare form of the jussive for **לְבָבֶךָ**, as in Ezek. xxxvii. 7; cf. Ewald, § 191, *b*. Reasons are given for these threats in vers. 12 and 13, first in the thought that Edom cannot continue to be the only one unpunished, then in the bringing forward of the solemnly uttered purpose of God. “Those who should not be compelled to drink.” Those meant are the Israelites, who, as the people of God, ought to have been free from the penal judgment with which the Lord visits the nations. If, now, these are not left (spared such an infliction), still less can Edom, as a heathen nation, lay claim to exemption. By this Jeremiah does not mean to say that any injustice befalls the Jews if they are obliged to drink the cup of the wrath of God, but merely that their having been chosen to be the people of God does not give them any right to exemption from the judgments of God on the world, *i.e.* if they make themselves like the heathen through their sins and vices. The inf. abs. **תַּשְׁ** for **תַּהֲ** intensifies: “ye shall (must) drink.” The idea is founded on that pervading chap. xxv., and there is use made of the words in xxv. 29. The **כִּ** in ver. 13 is mainly dependent on the clause immediately preceding: “thou shalt certainly drink.” On “by myself have I sworn” cf. xxii. 5. In the threat that Edom shall be laid waste there is an accumulation of words corresponding to the excitement of feeling accompanying an utterance under solemn oath. **תַּרְבֵּ**

is used instead of the more common חֲרֵבָה ; cf. xxv. 18, xliv. 22, etc. עֲלֵם חֲרֵבָות, as in xxv. 9. Bozrah was at that time the capital of the Edomites (cf. ver. 22) ; it lay south from the Dead Sea, on the site of the village Buseireh (Little Bozrah), in Jebal, which is still surrounded by a castle and with ruins of considerable extent, and is situated on an eminence ; see on Amos i. 12 and Gen. xxxvi. 33. "And all its cities," i.e. the rest of the cities of Idumea ; cf. יְבָנוֹת יְהֻדָּה, ver. 2.

Vers. 14-18. *The nature and occasion of the judgment decreed.* —Ver. 14. "I have heard tidings from Jahveh, and a messenger has been sent among the nations : Gather yourselves together, and go against her, and arise to the battle ! Ver. 15. For, behold, I have made thee small among the nations, despised among men. Ver. 16. Thy terribleness hath deceived thee, the pride of thy heart, O thou that dwellest in the hiding-places of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill. Though thou makest thy nest high like the eagle, thence will I bring thee down, saith Jahveh. Ver. 17. And Edom shall become an astonishment ; every passer-by shall be astonished at her, and shall hiss at all her plagues. Ver. 18. As [it was in] the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, saith Jahveh, no man shall dwell there, nor shall a son of man sojourn there."

This judgment will immediately take place. The nations who are to make Edom small and despised have been already summoned by the Lord to the war. Jeremiah has taken this idea from Obad. vers. 1, 2. The subject in "I have heard" is the prophet, who has heard the information from Jahveh. In Obadiah is found the plural, "we have heard," because the prophet includes himself among the people ; this is to show that the news serves as a consolation to Israel, because Edom shall be punished for his crimes committed against Judah. This view was not before the mind of Jeremiah ; with him the prevailing representation is, that judgment, from which Edom cannot be excepted, is passed upon all nations. Therefore he has chosen the singular, "I have heard." In the succeeding clause the perf. Pual חָלַשׁ has been changed into חָלַשׁ, as the more usual form. The messenger is to be considered as having been sent by the Lord for the purpose of summoning the nations to war, as he actually does in the second hemistich.

The message agrees, in the nature of its contents, with Obad. ver. 1; but Jeremiah has dealt somewhat freely with its form. The statement with regard to the object of the war, ver. 15, agrees pretty exactly with Obad. ver. 2. The account, too, which is given of the cause of the judgment, *i.e.* the guilt of Edom arising from his trusting in the impregnable character of his habitation, is derived from Obad. vers. 3, 4. Jeremiah has intensified the idea by the additional use of תִּפְלִצְתָּה, but has also made certain limitations of the expression by omitting some clauses found in Obadiah. The word just named is ἄπ. λεγ., and has been variously explained. The verb צָלַל occurs only in Job ix. 6, with the meaning of quaking, trembling; and the noun פְּנִזָּה pretty frequently in the sense of fear, shuddering, horror; further, מִפְלָצָה is used in 1 Kings xv. 13, 2 Chron. xv. 16, of an idol, monster, object of horror. Hence Rabbinical writers have been inclined to understand מִפְלָצָה as meaning idolatry; in this they are followed by J. D. Michaelis, Meier, and Nägelsbach. The last-named writer translates, "Thy monster (idol) led thee astray." But even though this meaning were better established from the use of language than it is, yet the mention of idolatry, or even of an idol, is quite unsuitable in this passage. The LXX. render ἡ πανηγία σου, *i.e.* risus or jocus tuus, Chald. תִּשְׁאַלְתָּךְ, "thy folly,"—evidently a mere guess from the context. The best ascertained translation is, "Thy terror," *i.e.* the terror which thou dost inspire, or the fear of thee, "hath misled thee, the pride of thine heart," so that "the pride," etc., forms an apposition to "thy terror." The combination of the fem. תִּפְלָצָת with the verb נִשְׁלַח in the masc. is not decisive against this. Following the example of Schleussner (*O arrogantiam tuam*), Hitzig and Graf would take the word as an exclamation, "Terror to thee! horror on thee!" and they point for support to הַפְּנִזָּם, Isa. xxix. 16. But an exclamation is out of place here, and incompatible with the derivation of the following words from Obadiah. Since Jeremiah appropriates from Obadiah the thought, "thy pride hath misled thee," תִּפְלָצָת may possibly be meant as a mere intensification of לִבְךָ. The pride of Edom increased because the other nations were afraid to make war on him in his rocky dwelling, so difficult of access. On

שָׁבֵנִי בְּחִנֵּי הַפְּלָעָה, see on Obad. ver. 3. The succeeding apposition-clause מֵרָום שְׁבָתוֹ, found in Obadiah, is modified by Jeremiah into תִּפְשֵׁי מֵרָום גְּבֻעָה, "thou that seighest, or holdest (as in xl. 10), the height of the hill." In the expression חִנֵּי הַפְּלָעָה there is perhaps implied an allusion to the rock-city סְלָעָה, or *Petra*, in the Wady Musa (see on 2 Kings xiv. 7), and in another allusion to Bozrah, which lay on a hill; see on ver. 13. On ver. 16, cf. Obad. ver. 4. Jeremiah has omitted the hyperbolic addition, "among the stars." In vers. 17 and 18 the devastation of Edom is further portrayed. On ver. 17a, cf. xxv. 11, 38; with 17b agrees xix. 8, almost word for word. The comparison with Sodom, etc., is a reminiscence from Deut. xxix. 22, and is repeated in the prophecy concerning Babylon, l. 40; cf. Isa. xiii. 19, Amos iv. 11. "Her neighbours" are Admah and Zeboim, Deut. xxix. 22, Hos. xi. 8. The comparison with Sodom is not so to be understood as if it indicated that Edom shall be destroyed in the same manner as Sodom; it is merely stated that the land of Edom shall become a desert waste, like the region of the Dead Sea, uninhabited, and with no human beings in it; cf. ver. 33 and l. 40.

Vers. 19-22. *The execution of the judgment, and fall of Edom.*—Ver. 19. "Behold, he shall come up like a lion from the glory of Jordan, to the dwelling of rock: but in a moment will I drive him away from her, and will appoint over her him who is chosen; for who is like me? and who will summon me [before the judge]? and what shepherd shall stand before me? Ver. 20. Therefore hear the counsel of Jahveh which He hath counselled against Edom, and His purposes which He has purposed against the inhabitants of Teman: Surely they shall drag them about, the little ones of the flock; surely he shall lay waste their dwelling over them. Ver. 21. At the noise of their fall the earth trembles; a cry—its noise is heard in the Red Sea. Ver. 22. Behold, he shall come like the eagle and dart after [his prey], and spread his wings over Bozrah; and the heart of the mighty men of Edom in that day shall become like the heart of a woman travailing."

As a lion coming up out of the thicket of reeds at the Jordan (פָּנָן הַיַּרְדֵּן, see on xii. 5) suddenly attacks a flock, so shall he who executes the judgment attack the Edomites in

their strong habitations, and at once put them to flight. The foe or general who executes the judgment is here no further pointed out, as in xlvi. 18, xlviii. 20; but he is merely set forth as a lion, and in ver. 22 as an eagle that in its flight darts down on its prey. נָהָא אַיִּתְן, pasture or dwelling of permanence; as אַיִּתְן is used in Num. xxiv. 21 of the rocky range of Sinai, so is it used here of the rocky range of Seir (חַנְנֵי הַפְּלָעָה, ver. 16). The translation “evergreen pasture” (Graf, Nägelebach) cannot be defended; for neither אַיִּתְן, “continual, enduring,” nor נָהָא, “pasture-ground, dwelling,” includes the notion of green grass. Quite baseless is the assumption of Hitzig, that the former word means the “shepherd” as remaining with the flock. אָרְפִּיעָה, “I shall wink,” stands for the adverb, “immediately, at once.” אָרְצֵנָה מִלְּיָה, “I will make him (Edom) run,” *i.e.* drive him, “from it,” his habitation (which is construed as fem. *ad sensum*). Jahveh sends the lion; Jahveh is not compared with the lion (Hitzig). In פַּי בְּחָאָר the former word is not the interrogative pronoun, but the indefinite *quicunque*, as in Ex. xxiv. 14; cf. Ewald, 332, b. And the latter word is not “the valiant shepherd” (Hitzig), but signifies “chosen.” אַלְּקִיָּה is used instead of עַלְּקִיָּה; and בָּקָר עַל means to “set over” something, as the chief, superior. The idea is, that God will frighten away the Edomites out of their land by a lion, and appoint him as the shepherd whom He chooses for that purpose. None can prevent this, for there is none like Jahveh in strength or power, and none can call Him to account for His doing. יִעַרְגֵּג (from עַד), in Hiphil, to “summon before the court of justice,” *i.e.* to call on one to make a defence; cf. Job ix. 19. Nor can any shepherd stand before Jahveh, *i.e.* defend his flock. These words are directed against the rulers of Edom, who foolishly imagined they were secure, and could not be touched in their rock-fortresses. The words, moreover, contain general truths, so that we cannot apply בְּחָאָר to historical persons, such as Nebuchadnezzar or Alexander the Great.—Ver. 20. This truth the Edomites are to lay to heart, and to hear, *i.e.* consider the purpose which the Lord has formed regarding Edom. Teman is not synonymous with Edom, but the inhabitants of Teman are specially named together with Edom in the parallel member, because they

were particularly famous for their wisdom (ver. 7), and in their pride over this wisdom, held the counsels of God in very small esteem. The counsel of God, the thoughts which He has conceived regarding Edom, follow in the clauses which are introduced with solemn assurance. יְסַחְבּוּם עַעֲרֵי הַצָּאן is rendered by the Vulgate, *si non dejecerint eos parvuli gregis*, which Luther follows in his translation, “if the shepherd-boys will not drag them away.” And C. B. Michaelis and Hävernick (on Ezekiel, p. 415) still view the words as meaning that “the least of the flock” will drag away Edom; *i.e.* the covenant people, weak and miserable though they are, will be victorious over Edom: in support of this rendering they point to Ezek. xxv. 14. But though Ezekiel clearly declares that the Lord will satisfy His revenge on Edom by means of His people Israel, yet it does not follow from this that Ezekiel had this passage of Jeremiah in his mind, and sought so to apply it. In spite of the clearness with which the thought is expressed by Obadiah and Ezekiel, that Edom will at last become the prey of the people of God, we would expect to find it in Jeremiah only as a simple inference from his words; for Jeremiah does not, like Obadiah and Ezekiel, mention the enmity of Edom to Israel as the cause of his guilt, but only the pride of his heart. Against taking “the little ones of the flock” as the subject of the clause, we find these considerations: (1) סַחְבּ, “to pull, drag away,” does not well apply to sheep, but rather points to dogs (xv. 3) or lions, which drag away their prey. (2) The context is far from leading us to understand, by the little ones of the sheep, Israel or the people of God, either here or where the words are repeated, 1. 45; while Zech. ii. 7 and xiii. 7 are passages which cannot be held as regulating this verse. In ver. 19 the rulers of Edom are viewed as shepherds: in accordance with this figure, the Edomites are in ver. 20 called sheep, and weak, helpless ones too. The subject of סַחְבּוּם is indefinite: “the enemy will advance like a lion out of the jungle of the Jordan;” the suffix precedes the noun, as in xlvi. 44, etc. The fate of Edom will be so terrible, that their pasture-ground, their habitation, will be astonished at it. The Hiphil שָׁמַם is formed, like שָׁמַם in Num. xxi. 20, from שָׁמַם; not, however, with the sense of “laying waste,” which the construction with לְ of a person

does not suit, but with the meaning of “making astonished,” as in Ezek. xxxii. 10, and only here with the directly causative sense of manifesting, showing astonishment or amazement.—Ver. 21. The fall of Edom will be so fearful, that the earth will tremble, and the cry of anguish from the perishing people will be heard on the Red Sea. מִלְּאָה is the inf. Kal with suffix. The threatening concludes, in ver. 22, with the same thought through which destruction is threatened to the Moabites, xlvi. 40 ff. The comparison of the enemy to an eagle is continued in the expression, “he shall come up;” the coming up, however, does not mean the rising of the eagle into the air, but refers to the enemy: to march as an enemy against Edom.

With reference to the fulfilment of this prophecy, we have already pointed out, on Num. xxiv. 18, and at the close of the exposition in Obadiah, that the threatened devastation of the land of Edom was brought about by the Chaldeans, as is clear from Mal. i. 3; but the annihilation of the people was commenced by the Maccabees, and completed by the Romans, about the time of the Jewish war.

Vers. 23–27. CONCERNING DAMASCUS.—Aram, on this side of the Euphrates, or Syria, was divided, in the times of Saul and David, into the kingdoms of Damascus, Zobah, and Hamath, of which the second, extending between Damascus and Hamath (see on 2 Sam. viii. 3), or situated north-eastward from Damascus, between the Orontes and the Euphrates, was the most powerful; its kings were defeated by Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 47), and afterwards conquered and made tributary to the kingdom of Israel by David, who did the same to the Syrians of Damascus that had come to the assistance of Hadadezer king of Zobah (2 Sam. viii. and x.). After the death of David and during the time of Solomon, a freebooter named Rezon, who had broken away from Hadadezer during the war, established himself in Damascus (see on 1 Kings xi. 23–25), and became the founder of a dynasty which afterwards made vassals of all the smaller kings of Syria, whose number is given 1 Kings xx. 1. This dynasty also, under the powerful rulers Benhadad I. and II. and Hazael, long pressed hard on the kingdom of Israel, and conquered a great part of the Israelite territory (1 Kings xv. 18 ff., xx. 1 ff., xxii. 3 ff.; 2 Kings v. 1 ff.,

vi. 8 ff., viii. 28 f., x. 32 f., xii. 18 ff., xiii. 3 ff.). At last, King Joash, after the death of Hazael, succeeded in retaking the conquered cities from his son, Benhadad III. (2 Kings xiii. 19 ff.); and Jeroboam II. was able to restore the ancient frontiers of Israel as far as Hamath (2 Kings xiv. 25). Some decades later, Rezin king of Damascus, in alliance with Pekah of Israel, undertook a war of conquest against Judah during the time of Ahaz, who therefore called to his aid the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser. This monarch conquered Damascus, and put an end to the Syrian kingdom, by carrying away the people to Kir (2 Kings xv. 37, xvi. 5-9). This kingdom of Syria is called "Damascus" in the prophets, after its capital. We find threats of destruction and ruin pronounced against it even by such early prophets as Amos (i. 3-5), for its cruelty committed against Israel, and Isaiah (xvii. 1 ff.), because of its having combined with Israel to destroy Judah. According to the use of language just referred to, "Damascus," mentioned in the heading of this prophecy, is not the city, but the kingdom of Syria, which has been named after its capital, and to which, besides Damascus, belonged the powerful cities of Hamath and Arpad, which formerly had kings of their own (Isa. xxxvii. 13). Jeremiah does not mention any special offence. In the judgment to come on all nations, Aram-Damascus cannot remain exempt.

Ver. 23. "Hamath is ashamed, and Arpad, for they have heard evil tidings: they despair; there is trouble on the sea; no one can rest. Ver. 24. Damascus has become discouraged, she has turned to flee: terror has seized her; distress and pains have laid hold on her, like a woman in childbirth. Ver. 25. How is the city of praise not left, the city of my delight? Ver. 26. Therefore shall her young men fall in her streets, and all the men of war shall be silent in that day, saith Jahveh of hosts. Ver. 27. And I will kindle a fire in the wall of Damascus, and it shall devour the palaces of Benhadad."

The largest cities of Aram are seized with consternation and discouragement. Damascus would flee, but its men of war fall by the sword of the enemy, and the city is in flames. The description of the terror which overpowers the inhabitants of Aram begins with *Hamath* (*Epiphaneia* of the Greeks, now

called Hamah), which lies north from Hums (Emesa), on the Orontes (el 'Asi); see on Gen. x. 17 and Num. xxxiv. 8. *Arpad* is always mentioned in connection with Hamath (Isa. x. 9, xxxvi. 19, xxxvii. 13; 2 Kings xviii. 34 and xix. 13): in the list of Assyrian synonyms published by Oppert and Schrader, it is sounded Arpadda; and judging by the name, it still remains in the large village of Arfâd, mentioned by Marasç., about fifteen miles north from Haleb (Aleppo); see on 2 Kings xviii. 34. The bad news which Hamath and Arpad have heard is about the approach of a hostile army. "She is ashamed," i.e. disappointed in her hope and trust (cf. xvii. 13), with the accessory idea of being confounded. נִמְוֵג, to be fainthearted from fear and anxiety; cf. Josh. ii. 9, 24, Ex. xv. 15, etc. There is a difficulty with the expression בַּיִם דְּאַנְהָה, from the mention of the sea. Ewald has therefore invented a new word, בַּיִם, which is stated to signify *mind, heart*; and he translates, "their heart is in trouble." Graf very rightly remarks, against this, that there was no occasion whatever for the employment of a word which occurs nowhere else. The simplest explanation is that of J. D. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and Maurer: "on the sea," i.e. onwards to the sea, "anxiety prevails." The objection of Graf, that on this view there is no nominative to יְבָלֶל, cannot make this explanation doubtful, because the subject (Ger. *man*, Fr. *on*, Eng. *people, they*) is easily obtained from the context. The words יְבָלֶל הַשְׁׁמָעָת לֹא יְבָלֶל form a reminiscence from Isa. lvii. 20, where they are used of the sea when stirred up, to which the wicked are compared. But it does not follow from this that the words are to be understood in this passage also of the sea, and to be translated accordingly: "in the sea there is no rest," i.e. the sea itself is in ceaseless motion (Hitzig); or with a change of בַּיִם into בַּיִם, "there is a tumult like the sea, which cannot keep quiet" (Graf). As little warrant is there for concluding, from passages like Jer. xvii. 12 ff., where the surging of the Assyrian power is compared to the roaring of the waves of the sea, that the unrest of the inhabitants of Syria, who are in a state of anxious solicitude, is here compared to the restless surging and roaring of the sea (Umbreit). For such a purpose, דְּאַנְהָה, "concern, solicitude," is much too weak, or rather inappropriate.—Ver. 24. רְפָתָה דְּמָשָׁק, "Damascus has become

slack," *i.e.* discouraged ; she turns to flee, and cannot escape, being seized with trembling and anxiety. חַזְקָה is not the third pers. fem., *prehendit terrorem*, but stands for חַזְקָה, with Mappik omitted, because the tone is retracted in consequence of the Athnach ; cf. vi. 24, viii. 21, etc. "Terror has seized Damascus." In the last clause וְחַבְלִים is subsumed along with צְרָה ; hence the verb is put in the singular.—Ver. 25. The question, "How is not," etc., has been differently explained. Eichhorn, Gesenius, Ewald, and Umbreit take the words according to the German usage, in the sense, "How is the city forsaken?" or laid waste. But this Germanism is foreign to the Hebrew ; and it is not obviated by C. B. Michaelis taking "how" in the sense of *quam inopinato et quam horribiliter non deserta est*, so that the words would mean *nullus est modus desertionis aut gradus quem Damascus non sit experta*, because אֵיךְ לְאֵיךְ does not express the kind and manner, or the degree of an action. In the only other passage where אֵיךְ לְאֵיךְ occurs (2 Sam. i. 14) the negative has its full meaning. Others (Calvin, Schnurrer, J. D. Michaelis, Rosemüller, Maurer) take בַּעַד in the sense of leaving free, untouched : "How has she not been left untouched?" *i.e.* been spared. But this meaning of the verb is nowhere found. There is no other course left than, with Nägelsbach, to take the verb as referring to the desertion of the city through the flight of the inhabitants, as in iv. 29, etc., and to take the words thus : "How is (*i.e.* how has it happened that) the famous city (is) not forsaken?" According to this view, it is not the desolation of the city that is bewailed, but the fact that the inhabitants have not saved their lives by flight. The way is prepared for this thought by ver. 24, where it is said that the inhabitants of Damascus wish to flee, but are seized with convulsive terror ; in ver. 25 also there is a more specific reason given for it, where it is stated that the youths (the young warriors) and all the men of war shall fall in the streets of the city, and be slain by foes. The suffix in "my delight" refers to the prophet, and expresses his sympathy for the fall of the glorious city (see on xlviii. 31) ; because not only does its population perish, but the city itself also (ver. 27) is to be burned to ashes.—Ver. 27 has been imitated from Amos i. 4 and ver. 14 conjointly. בְּחֹטֶף, not "on," but "in," *i.e.* "within the

wall." "The palaces of Benhadad" are the palaces of the Syrian kings generally, because three kings of Damascus bore this name.

The fulfilment of this threat cannot be proved historically, from want of information. Since Pharaoh-Necho had conquered Syria as far as the Euphrates, it is very possible that, after the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish, in the conquest of Syria by Nebuchadnezzar, Damascus was harshly treated. The prophecy is, however, so general in its statement, that we need not confine its fulfilment to the conquest by Nebuchadnezzar.

Vers. 28–33. “CONCERNING KEDAR AND THE KINGDOMS OF HAZOR, which Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon smote.” (The *Kethib* נַבְכָּרְאַצּוֹר is perhaps merely an error in transcription occasioned by the occurrence of the preceding חַצּוֹר.) *Kedar*, the Kedarenes, a Bedouin nation descended from Ishmael, dwelling in tents throughout the region between Arabia Petræa and Babylonia (see on Gen. xxv. 13 and Ezek. xxvii. 21), is here, no doubt, a general name for all the nomadic tribes and shepherd nations of Arabia. Hazor elsewhere occurs only as the name of various cities in Palestine (Josh. xi. 1, xv. 23, 25, xix. 23; Nah. xi. 33), of which we need not think here, since it is Arabians who are spoken of. No locality or region of this name in Arabia is known. Jeremiah appears to have formed the name for the purpose of designating those Arabians who dwelt in חַצּוֹרִים, “courts” or “villages,” and who thus differed from the Bedouins proper, or nomads and dwellers in tents; cf. Isa. xlvi. 11 with Gen. xxv. 16. The settled Arabians are to this day called *Hadarijeh*, in contrast with *Wabarijeh*, who dwell in tents. “*Hadār*, חַצּוֹר, is the settled dwelling-place, in contrast with *bedū*, the steppe, where the tents are pitched, sometimes here, sometimes there, and only for a time” (Delitzsch on Isa. xlvi. 11, vol. ii. p. 182 of Clark’s translation). “The kingdoms of Hazor” are the regions of the settled tribes, ruled by their own princes or sheiks; cf. xxv. 24.¹ In the prophecy, the general designation, “children of the east,” i.e. Orientals,

¹ According to Mr. v. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Ass. u. Bab.* p. 210, "Hazor is the modern Hajar, a region which occupies the whole north-eastern corner of the Nejed, and to which, in the wider sense, Lascha, the region on the

alternates with Kedar: the former is the most common name given to the tribes living to the east of Palestine, in the wilderness: cf. Judg. vi. 3, Job i. 3, Ezek. xxv. 4. Instead of this name, Josephus uses the designation "Arabians" (*Ant.* v. 6. 1); later, "Nabateans" or "Kedarenes" became common. Here also (ver. 32) is used the special designation קָצֵץ פָּה [cut (at) the corner (of the hair)], which points to the custom, usual among several of these Bedouin tribes, of cropping the hair of the head and beard; see on ix. 25 and xxv. 23.

Ver. 28b. "Thus saith Jahveh, Arise, go up to Kedar, and destroy the children of the east. Ver. 29. Their tents and their flocks shall they take: their curtains, and all their vessels, and their camels shall they carry away for themselves; and they shall cry over them, Fear is on every side. Ver. 30. Flee! wander far, dwell deep, ye inhabitants of Hazor, saith Jahveh; for Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon hath taken counsel against you, and hath devised a plan against them. Ver. 31. Arise! go up against a nation at ease, dwelling carelessly, saith Jahveh; it has no gates nor bars—they dwell alone. Ver. 32. And their camels shall be a prey, and the multitude of their herds a spoil; and I will scatter them to every wind who have cut the corner [of their beards], and from all sides will I bring their destruction, saith Jahveh. Ver. 33. And Hazor shall be an habitation of jackals, a desolation for ever. No man shall dwell there, nor shall a son of man sojourn in it."

This prophecy consists of two brief strophes, which begin with a summons to the army of the enemy to wage war on the Arabians (ver. 28b and ver. 31), and then announce the execution of this order; the arrangement, moreover, is such that there is attached to the first strophe a summons to the Arabians to save themselves by flight (ver. 30), while the other concludes with the threat that their territory shall be destroyed (ver. 33). — Ver. 28. **עַלְהָ** is used with **לֹא** instead of **לְ**, to signify hostile advance against a nation or city. **שְׁרֵךְ** with Qametz-Hatnph (without Metheg) is imperative; cf. Ewald, § 227, *i*, with 251, *c*. The verbs **קָחָה** and **יִשְׁאַל** in ver. 29 are not jussives *coast, also belongs.*" But **חַצֵּר**, from **חַצֵּר**, which corresponds to **حَصَر** or **حَصَرَ**, is fundamentally different from **حَبَرَ** or **حَبَرَ**.

(Ewald, Umbreit, etc.), but imperfects, describing what takes place in consequence of the order given. Tents and flocks of sheep and goats, curtains and vessels, together with camels, form the property and wealth of the nomads. נָשַׁׁי, to take away, carry off; לְהַמֵּ, *sibi*. They call out over them, as if it were a watch-cry, "Horror around:" on this expression, see vi. 25. This justifies the call addressed to them, "Flee," etc. To נָסַׁ is added נָדַׁי for the purpose of intensifying, and this again is further strengthened by appending מָאַד: "Use every effort to flee." הַעֲמִיקָׁ לְשָׁבַת as in ver. 8. A reason is given for the summons, in the statement that Nebuchadnezzar, as the instrument of Jahveh, has formed a plan against them; cf. ver. 20 and xviii. 11. Instead of עַלְרָם, many mss. and the ancient versions have עַלְכָם, in conformity with the first member. In all probability, the original reading is "against them," inasmuch as "the discourse, as in other instances, makes a transition, in the last portion, from direct address to a calmer style of speaking" (Ewald).—Ver. 31 does not declare the plan of the king of Babylon; but the words, "Arise, go ye up," etc., are once more the summons of the Lord, as is shown by the expression "saith Jahveh." The enemy is to march against a peaceful nation, dwelling securely, that has neither doors nor bars, *i.e.* does not live in cities surrounded by walls with gates and bars (cf. 1 Sam. xxiii. 7, Deut. iii. 5), whose territory, therefore, is easily conquered. They dwell alone, apart from others, without connection and intercourse with other nations, from which they could obtain help and support. שְׁלִוִי, like יְשִׁיר, Job xxxvi. 2, Dan. vii. 8, is a Chaldaizing form; elsewhere it is written שְׁלִוָּ, Job xxi. 23, or שְׁלִוָּ, Job xvi. 12. As to living securely, cf. Judg. xviii. 7, Ezek. xxxviii. 11; on living alone, xv. 17. This last is elsewhere said only of Israel, Num. xxiii. 9, Deut. xxxiii. 28. Their possessions will become the spoil of the enemy; God will scatter them to every wind (cf. Ezek. v. 12, xii. 14), and bring destruction on them from every side (on עַבְרִי, cf. 1 Kings v. 4).—Ver. 33. The dwelling-places of the settled tribes (Hazor) shall become the habitation of jackals (cf. ix. 10), an uninhabited desolation for ever. Ver. 33b is in part a repetition of ver. 18.

With regard to the fulfilment of this prophecy, it follows

from the latter part of the title that Nebuchadnezzar had smitten the Arabian tribes, *i.e.* defeated them, and subjected them to his sway. But we have no historical information as to the time when this took place. M. von Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assyr. u. Bab.* S. 209) and Duncker (*Gesch. d. Alterth.* i. S. 427) suppose that Nebuchadnezzar, after he had returned home to Babylon from Hither Asia, having heard of the death of his father, after his victory at Carchemish, and after he had ascended the throne, "as it seems," first thought of extending his authority over the Arabians on the lower portion of the Euphrates, in North Arabia, and in the Syrian desert. This supposition may possibly be true, but cannot be raised to historic probability; moreover, it is connected, by the above-mentioned historians, with theories regarding the campaigns against Hither Asia which rest upon statements of Josephus that are very uncertain, and some of which can be proved to be incorrect. Such is the statement in *Antt.* x. 6. 1, that Nebuchadnezzar, after his victory at Carchemish, in pursuing the Egyptians to the borders of their country, did not touch Judea. The only notice we have, apart from Scripture, of the conquest of Arabia by Nebuchadnezzar, is that furnished by Josephus (*contra Ap.* i. 19) from Berossus: *κρατήσαι δέ φησι τὸν Βαβυλώνιον* (*i.e.* Nebuchadnezzar) *Αἰγύπτου, Συρίας, Φοινίκης, Ἀραβίας.* But this notice is stated in such indefinite and general terms, that nothing more specific can be inferred from it regarding the time and circumstances of the conquest of the Arabians.

Vers. 34-39. CONCERNING ELAM.—By the title (on the form of which, cf. xlvi. 1, xlvii. 1, and xiv. 1), the utterance regarding Elam is placed "in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah;" hence it was published later than the prophecies in chap. xlviii. and in xlix. 1-33, and not long before the prophecy regarding Babylon in chap. 1. Elam, a Shemitic people in Elymais, the Persian province of Susiana (the modern Husistân), which, except in Gen. xiv. 1, only appears in history when it had no longer a Shemitic but an Aryan language (see on Gen. x. 22 and Dan. viii. 2), is mentioned in Isa. xxii. 6 as serving in the Assyrian army, and in Isa. xxi. 6 as being, together with Madai (the Medes), the executors of judgment

against Babylon. That Elam still belonged, in the time of Esarhaddon, to the kingdom of Assyria, follows from Ezra iv. 9, where Elamites are mentioned among the colonists whom this Assyrian king transplanted into the depopulated kingdom of the ten tribes. But whether Elam, after the revolt of Media, also made itself independent of Assyria, or remained subject to this kingdom till it fell, we have no historical data to determine. The same must be said regarding the question whether, after the fall of Nineveh and the destruction of the Assyrian kingdom by the united armies of Nabopolassar from Babylon and Cyaxares from Media, Elam was incorporated with the Median or the Babylonian kingdom; for nothing more specific has been transmitted to us regarding the division of the conquered kingdom among the two victors. Judging from its geographical situation, we must probably come to the conclusion that Elam fell to the lot of the Medes. Seeing that there is an utter want, in other respects, of facts regarding the earlier history of Elam, neither can a historical occasion be made out for this prophecy. The supposition of Ewald, "that the wild and warlike Elamites (Isa. xxii. 6) had shortly before taken part with the Chaldeans as their allies in the deposition of Jehoiachin and the first great exile of the people, and had therein shown themselves particularly cruel," has no support of any kind, either in the contents of the prophecy or in the time when it was composed. The prophecy itself contains not the slightest indication of any hostility on the part of the Elamites towards Judah; nor is anything proved regarding this by the fact that the chastisement is not said to proceed from Nebuchadnezzar, but directly from Jahveh, since, in the oracles concerning Philistia, Edom, and Damascus also, Nebuchadnezzar is not mentioned, but Jahveh is named as the one who destroys these peoples and burns up their cities; cf. xlvi. 4, xlix. 10, 13 ff., 27. Add to this, that the assumption of Elamites being in Nebuchadnezzar's army is devoid of historic probability, since Elam, as has already been stated, hardly belonged to the Chaldean kingdom.¹

¹ No valid reason has been adduced for calling in question the statement in the title regarding the time when this prophecy was composed; yet this has been done by Movers, Hitzig, and Nägelsbach. "That the LXX. have given the heading twice, the first time briefly, and then fully at the end

Ver. 35. "Thus saith Jahveh of hosts: Behold, I will break the bow of Elam, the chief part of their strength. Ver. 36. And I will bring upon Elam four winds from the four ends of the heaven, and I will scatter them towards all these winds; and there shall be no nation where the scattered ones of Elam shall not come. Ver. 37. And I will make Elam terrified before their enemies, and before those who seek their life; and I will bring on them evil, the heat of my wrath, saith Jahveh; and I will send after them the sword, until I consume them. Ver. 38. And I will place my throne in Elam, and will destroy thence king and princes, saith Jahveh. Ver. 39. But it shall be in the end of the days, that I will turn the captivity of Elam, saith Jahveh."

Elam's martial power is to be destroyed, and its population scattered to the four winds among all nations (ver. 25 f.). The Lord will make them terrified before their enemies, and let them be pursued by the sword till they are swept away (ver. 37). In the country itself He will hold a tribunal, and destroy king and priests out of it (ver. 38). In ver. 35, the bow, as the chief weapon of the Elamites (cf. Isa. xxii. 6), is mentioned, by synecdoche, instead of all offensive and defensive weapons, for all the means of resistance and attack employed by this warlike nation. This, indeed, is shown by the apposition, "the first-fruits (*i.e.* the chief part) of their strength" or valour. To break the bow in pieces is thus equivalent to rendering defenceless. The plural suffix in בָּנְרָתָם points to Elam as a nation — the Elamites. Hitzig, Graf, and older expositors make an assumption which is both unnecessary and incapable

of the piece, merely shows that two different readings have *now* been combined in it" (Ewald). And Nägelsbach has yet to bring proof of the assurance given us when he says, "I consider it quite impossible that Jeremiah, in the beginning of Zedekiah's reign, should have thought of any other than Nebuchadnezzar as the instrument to be employed in executing judgment, or that he should even have left this matter *in suspenso*." If Jeremiah, as a prophet of the Lord, does not announce, as the word of Jahveh, mere human conjectures regarding the future, but only what the Spirit of the Lord suggested to him, neither could he set forth his own conjectures regarding the question by whom God the Lord was to scatter the Elamites to the four winds, but must leave it *in suspenso*, if the Spirit of the Lord had revealed nothing to him regarding it.

of proof, that קָשַׁת stands for גְּבֹרִים, and means “the valiant, brave people of war,” as in Isa. xxi. 17 and 1 Sam. ii. 4; but neither in these passages can the alleged meaning be fully made out.—Ver. 36. Through the working of God’s power, the Elamites shall be dispersed to all the four winds, *i.e.* to all parts of the earth. This exercise of power is represented under the figure of the four winds. The wind is the most appropriate among all earthly things for symbolizing the Spirit of God, or the energy of the divine operation; cf. Zech. vi. 5, Dan. vii. 2. The *Kethib* עַלְמָן in ver. 36 has evidently been written by mistake for עַלְמָן. The meaning of the figure is this: Elam is to be attacked on all sides by enemies, and be scattered in every direction. This is evident from ver. 37, where the figurative is changed for the literal, and the thought further extended. חַתֵּת, Hiphil from חַתֵּת, be broken to pieces, in Hiphil to dispirit through fear and terror; cf. i. 17. On the form in the text, which is shortened from חַתְּתָוִת through the shifting of the tone to the last syllable, cf. Ewald, § 234, *e.* רָעָה, “evil, misfortune,” is marked by the apposition, “the heat of mine anger,” as the emanation of God’s judgment of wrath. On 37b, cf. ix. 15. The Lord will sit in judgment on king and princes, and punish them with death. The throne is set for the Judge to sit in judgment; see xlivi. 10. Yet (ver. 39), in the Messianic future, blessing shall come on Elam; cf. xlix. 6, xlvi. 7.

If we compare this prophecy with the remaining prophecies of Jeremiah regarding the heathen nations, we shall find that it contains no reference whatever to any execution by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon of the judgment with which the Elamites are threatened; but it announces the fall of Elam and the dispersion of its inhabitants by enemies in a way so general, that, as Hävernick (on Daniel, p. 549) has remarked, it is an arbitrary addition for any one to make, if he thinks definitely of the Chaldeans [as the enemies of Elam], because, correctly viewed, the contents rather declare against a conquest by Nebuchadnezzar. “Jeremiah,” says Hävernick, “announces the utter extinction of the state as such, a general dispersion and annihilation of the people, a tribunal of punishment which the Lord Himself will hold over them,—features which

are far too strongly marked, and far too grand, to let us think that Elam is merely to be rendered tributary and incorporated into a new state. If we connect with this the deliverance of Elam mentioned at the close of ver. 39, viz. his conversion, then we will not hesitate to take the meaning of the oracle, in a more general way, as referring to the gradual fall of this heathen nation, for which, however, a future deliverance is in store, as is fully shown by the issue." This view is at least much more correct than the current one, still maintained by Ewald, Hitzig, Graf, etc., according to which the prophecy refers to a conquest of Elam by Nebuchadnezzar. M. von Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assyr. und Bab.* S. 210) attempts to show its probability from a notice in Strabo (xi. 524), and (on S. 212) from the intimation given in the book of Judith, chap. i., of a war between Nebuchadnezzar and Media, which was successfully concluded in the twelfth year of his reign. But the statement in Strabo, that the Kossaites, a nation of robbers, once sent 13,000 archers to help the Elamites against the Susites and Babylonians, is far too indefinite for us to be able to apply it to a war which Nebuchadnezzar in company with Media carried on against Elam; for the Susites are at least not Medes. And the notice in the book of Judith is self-evidently unhistorical; for it says that Nebuchadnezzar was king of the Assyrians and resided in the great city of Nineveh, and that he defeated Arphaxad the king of Media in the seventeenth year of his reign (Judith i. 1, 13). But Nebuchadnezzar neither resided in Nineveh, which had been destroyed shortly before; nor could he have made war on Arphaxad king of Media in the seventeenth year of his reign, because he had in that year begun to besiege Jerusalem with all his forces. But the additional considerations which Niebuhr brings forward in support of his hypothesis can as little stand the test. Neither Jer. xxv. 25, where the kings of Media and Elam are mentioned among those who are to drink the cup of wrath, nor Ezek. xxxii. 24 f., where Elam and the whole multitude of its people are brought forward as among those who were slain, and who sank into the nether parts of the earth, furnish proofs of the conquest and destruction of Elam by Nebuchadnezzar, or of a war between that king and Media. For the funeral-song in Ezekiel bears a thoroughly ideal

character, and announces the fall of all the heathen powers, without any regard to Nebuchadnezzar. This holds, too, in a sense, of Jer. xxv., where Nebuchadnezzar is certainly mentioned as the ruler into whose power all the nations are to be delivered for the space of seventy years, inasmuch as this announcement also launches out into the idea of a judgment of all nations; so that we are not entitled to assume that all the kingdoms of the earth, to whom the cup of wrath is presented, were to be conquered and brought under subjection by Nebuchadnezzar. Still less reason is there for inferring from Jer. xxvii. 3, that Nebuchadnezzar was involved in a war with Media at a time when, as is there stated, at the beginning of Zedekiah's reign, the kings of Edom, Moab, Ammon, and Phoenicia sent ambassadors to Jerusalem to recommend a coalition against the power of Babylon. Even if Nebuchadnezzar were then occupied in the eastern portion of his kingdom, yet there is nothing at all to prove that he was involved in war with Media or Elam. History says nothing of a war waged by Nebuchadnezzar on Elam, nor does this prophecy furnish any support for such an assumption. Although it does not set before us a "gradual ruin" of Elam (Hävernick), but rather a catastrophe brought on by God, yet the description is given in terms so general, that nothing more specific can be inferred from it regarding the time and the circumstances of this catastrophe. In this prophecy, Elam is not considered in its historical relation to the people of Israel, but as the representative of the heathen world lying beyond, which has not hitherto come into any relation towards the people of Israel, but which nevertheless, along with it, falls under the judgment coming on all nations, in order that, through the judgment, it may be led to the knowledge of the true God, and share in His salvation.

Chaps. I. and II.—*Against Babylon.*

The genuineness of this prophecy has been impugned by the newer criticism in different ways; for some quite refuse to allow it as Jeremiah's, while others consider it a mere interpolation.¹ Hitzig (*Exeg. Handb.* 2 Aufl.) considers that this

¹ With regard to the special attacks and their refutation, see details in Keil's *Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament* [translated by Prof.

oracle, with its epilogue, li. 59-64, is not to be wholly rejected as spurious, as has been done by Von Cölln and Gramberg; he is so much the less inclined to reject it, because, although there is many an interpolated piece here and there (?), yet no independent oracle has hitherto been found in Jeremiah that is wholly interpolated. "In fact," he continues, "this oracle shows numerous traces of its genuineness, and reasons for maintaining it. The use of particular words (l. 6, li. 1, 5, 7, 14, 45, 55), and the circle of figures employed (li. 7, 8, 34, 37), as well as the style (l. 2, 3, 7, 8, 10), especially in turns like li. 2; the concluding formula, li. 57; the dialogue introduced without any forewarning, li. 51,— all unmistakeably reveal Jeremiah; and this result is confirmed by chronological data." These chronological data, which Hitzig then extracts from particular verses, we cannot certainly esteem convincing, since they have been obtained through a method of exegesis which denies the spirit and the essential nature of prophecy; but his remarks concerning Jeremiah's use of words and his circle of images are perfectly well-founded, and may be considerably corroborated if the matter were more minutely investigated. Notwithstanding all this, Ewald has again repeated, in the second edition of his work on the Prophets, the assertion first made by Eichhorn, that this prophecy is spurious. He

Douglas, in Clark's F. T. L. vol. i. p. 342 ff.]. To the list there given of the defenders of this prophecy (of whom Kueper, Hävernick, and Nägelsbach in the monograph entitled *der Prophet Jeremias und Babylon*, 1850, have thoroughly discussed the question), we must add the name of Graf, who, in the remarks prefixed to his commentary on chap. I. f., has thoroughly examined the arguments of his opponents, and reached this result: "The prophecy contains nothing which Jeremiah could not have written in the fourth year of Zedekiah; and the style of writing itself exhibits all the peculiarities which present themselves in his book. This prophecy is therefore as much his work as the prophecies against the other foreign nations." Only the passage li. 15-19, a repetition of x. 12-16, is said to proceed from another hand, because it stands out of all connection with what precedes and what follows it (but see the exposition); while he has so fully vindicated, as genuine portions of the prophecy, other passages which had been assumed as interpolations, even by Nägelsbach in his monograph, that the latter, in treating of Jeremiah in Lange's *Bibelwerk* [see Clark's Translation, p. 419], has renounced his former doubts, and now declares that it is only the passage in li. 15-19 that he cannot regard as original.

does not, indeed, deny that “this long piece against Babylon has many words, turns of expression, and thoughts, nay, even the whole plan, in common with Jeremiah; and since Jeremiah is often accustomed in other places also to repeat himself, this might, at the first look, even create a prepossession favouring the opinion that it was composed by Jeremiah himself. But Jeremiah repeats himself in a more wholesale style, and is not unfaithful to himself in his repetitions: here, however, the Jeremianic element peers through only in single though very numerous passages, and the repeated portions are often completely transformed. What, therefore, appears here as Jeremianic is rather a studied repetition and imitation, which would require here to be all the stronger, when the piece was intended to pass as one of Jeremiah’s writings.” Ewald goes on to say that Babylon appears already as directly threatened by Cyrus; and the whole view taken of Babylon as a kingdom utterly degenerated, and unable any longer to escape the final destruction,—the prophetic impetuosity shown in rising up against the Chaldean oppression,—the public summons addressed to all the brethren living in Babylon, that they should flee from the city, now irrecoverably lost, and return to the holy land,—the distinct mention of the Medes and other northern nations as the mortal enemies of Babylon, and of the speedy and certain fall of this city;—all this, says Ewald, is foreign to Jeremiah, nay, even conflicting and impossible. For particular proof of this sweeping verdict, Ewald refers to the name שָׁשָׁךְ (li. 41, as in xxv. 26) for Babylon, לְבָבָקְמִי for פְּשָׁרִים, li. 1, and similar circumlocutions for Chaldean names, li. 21. He refers also to certain words which are quite new, and peculiar only to Ezekiel and later writers: סְנָה, פְּתָחָה, li. 23, 25, 27; גְּלִילִים, li. 2; בְּרִידִים as a designation of false prophets, li. 36; also to הַחֲרִים, to devote with a curse, li. 21, 26, li. 3, which in the rest of Jeremiah occurs only xxv. 9. Further, he refers to the headings found in li. 1 and li. 59, which are quite different from what Jeremiah himself would have written; and lastly, to the intimate connection subsisting between li. 27, li. 40, and Isa. xxxiv. 6 ff., between li. 39 and Isa. xxxiv. 14, and between li. 60 ff. and Jer. xxxiv. 16. But all these considerations are much too weak to prove the spuriousness of the

passage before us. The connection with Isa. xxxiv. quite agrees with Jeremiah's characteristic tendency to lean on older prophecies, and reproduce the thoughts contained in them (we merely recall the case of the prophecy concerning Moab in chap. xlviii., against whose genuineness even Ewald has nothing to say); and it can be brought to tell against the genuineness of this oracle only on the groundless supposition that Isa. xxxiv. originated in exile times. The headings given in l. 1 and li. 59 contain nothing whatever that would be strange in Jeremiah: li. 59 is not a title at all, but the commencement of the account regarding the charge which Jeremiah gave to Seraiah when he was going to Babylon, with reference to his carrying with him the prophecy concerning Babylon; and the heading in l. 1 almost exactly agrees with that in xlvi. 13 (see the exposition). Of the alleged later words, **הַחֲרִים** and **גָּלִילִים** are derived from the Pentateuch, **בְּנִים** from Isa. xliv. 25. **שָׁמֶן** and **פְּתַחַת** certainly were not known to the Hebrews till the invasions of Judah by the Assyrians and Chaldeans; but the latter of the two words we find as early as in the address of the Assyrians in Isa. xxxvi. 9, and the former in Isa. xli. 25: thus, not a single one of the words alleged to have been first used by Ezekiel is peculiar to him. Finally, of the circumlocutions used for the names "Babylon" and "Chaldeans," Ewald himself confesses that **שְׁשָׁךְ** in xxv. 26 may be Jeremiah's; and he has yet to give proof for the assertion that the names cited are merely circumlocutions in which a play is made on words that did not come into vogue till after Jeremiah's time. And as little has been even attempted in the way of establishing the opinion he has expressed regarding what is Jeremianic in the prophecy,—that it is a studied repetition and imitation,—or the assertion that Babylon is represented as being directly threatened by Cyrus. In the Old Testament Scriptures, Cyrus is represented as the king of Persia, which he was; but this prophecy says nothing of the Persians. Thus, the learned supplementary matter with which Ewald seeks to support his general assertions is by no means fitted to strengthen his position, but rather shows that the proper argument for rejecting this oracle as spurious is not to be found in the nature of this particular prophecy, but in the axiom openly expressed by

Eichhorn, von Cölln, Gramberg, and other followers of the “vnlgar rationalism,” that Jeremiah could not have announced the destruction of Babylon by the Medes, because at his time the Medes had not yet appeared on the scene of history as a conquering nation; for, according to the principles of rationalism, the prophets could merely prophesy of things which lay within the political horizon. It has not escaped the acute observation of Hitzig, that the genuineness of this prophecy could not be shaken by such general assertions; hence he has adopted Movers’ hypothesis of numerous interpolations, in order thereby to account for the use made of portions of Isaiah, which, on dogmatic grounds, are referred to the exile. But for this assumption also there are wanting proofs that can stand the test. Besides the general assertion that Jeremiah could not have repeated earlier pieces word for word, the arguments which Movers and Hitzig bring forward from the context, or from a consideration of the contents, in the case of isolated verses, depend upon false renderings of words, conjectures of a merely subjective character, and misunderstandings of various kinds, which at once fall to the ground when the correct explanation is given.

The germ of this prophecy lies in the word of the Lord, chap. xxv. 12, “When seventy years are completed, I will punish the king of Babylon and that nation for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and make it everlasting desolations;” and its position with regard to the other prophecies of Jeremiah against the nations has already been given in outline in the statement of xxv. 26, “And the king of Sheshach (Babylon) shall drink after them.” Just as these utterances (xxv. 12, 26) stand in full accord with the announcement that, in the immediate future, all nations shall be given into the power of the king of Babylon, and serve him seventy years; so, too, the prophecy against Babylon now lying before us not only does not stand in contradiction with the call addressed to Jeremiah, that he should proclaim to his contemporaries the judgment which Babylon is to execute on Judah and all nations, but it rather belongs to the complete solution of the problems connected with this call. The announcement of the fall of Babylon, and the release of Israel from Babylon, form

the subject of the prophecy, which is more than a hundred verses in length. This double subject, the two parts of which are so closely connected, is portrayed in a series of images which, nearly throughout, are arranged pretty loosely together, so that it is impossible to summarize the rich and varied contents of these figures, and to sketch a correct plan of the course of thought and of the divisions of the oracle. Hence, too, the views of expositors with regard to the division of the whole into parts or strophes widely differ;¹ we follow the view of Ewald, that the whole falls into three main parts (l. 2–28, l. 29 on to li. 26, and li. 27–58), every one of which begins with a spirited exhortation to engage in battle. These three main portions again fall into ten periods, of which the first three (l. 2–10, 11–20, and 21–28) form the first main division; the four middle ones form the second main portion (l. 29–40, ver. 41 to li. 4, vers. 5–14, and vers. 15–26); while the following three form the last (vers. 27–37, 38–49, and 50–58). We further agree with what Ewald says regarding the contents of the first two parts in general, viz. that in the first the prevailing view is the necessity for the deliverance of Israel, and that in the second, the antithesis between Babylon on the one hand, and Jahveh together with Israel, His spiritual instrument, on the other, is fully brought out; but we do not agree with his remark concerning the third part, that there the prevailing feature is the detailed description of the condition of Israel at that time, for this does not at all agree with the contents of li. 27–58. Rather, the address rises into a triumphant description of the fall of Babylon, in which the Lord will show Himself as the avenger of His people. On the whole, then, the prophecy is neither wanting in arrangement

¹ Thus, according to Eichhorn, Dahler, and Rosenmüller, the whole consists of several pieces (three or six) which originally belonged to different periods; according to Schmieder, it consists of "seven different poems or songs, all having the same subject, which, however, they set forth from different sides, and under countless images." Nägelsbach at first assumed that there were three main divisions, with thirteen subdivisions; afterwards, in Lange's *Bibelwerk* [see Clark's Foreign Theol. Library], he thinks he is able also to distinguish three stages of time, which, however, do not permit of being sharply defined, so that he continues to divide the whole prophecy into nineteen separate views or figures.

nor in that necessary progress in the development of thought which proves unity of conception and execution.

Chap. l. 1. The title, “The word which Jahveh spake concerning Babylon, concerning the land of the Chaldeans, by Jeremiah the prophet,” follows xlvi. 13 in choosing **אָשֶׁר בָּבֶד יְהוָה** instead of the usual **אָשֶׁר הָיָה**, and deviates from that passage only in substituting “by the hand of Jeremiah” for “to Jeremiah,” as in xxxvii. 2. The preference of the expression “spake by the hand of” for “spake to,” is connected with the fact that the following prophecy does not contain a message of the Lord which came to Jeremiah, that he might utter it before the people, but a message which he was to write down and send to Babylon, li. 60 ff. The apposition to “Babylon,” viz. “the land of the Chaldeans,” serves the purpose of more exactly declaring that “Babylon” is to be understood not merely of the capital, but also of the kingdom; cf. vers. 8, 45, and 51, 54.

Vers. 2-10. *The fall of Babylon, and deliverance of Israel.*—Ver. 2. “Tell it among the nations, and cause it to be heard, and lift up a standard; cause it to be heard, conceal it not: say, Babylon is taken, Bel is ashamed, Merodach is confounded; her images are ashamed, her idols are confounded. Ver. 3. For there hath come up against her a nation out of the north; it will make her land a desolation, and there shall be not an inhabitant in it: from man to beast, [all] have fled, are gone. Ver. 4. In those days, and at that time, saith Jahveh, the children of Israel shall come, they and the children of Judah together; they shall go, weeping as they go, and shall seek Jahveh their God. Ver. 5. They shall ask for Zion, with their faces [turned to] the road hitherwards, [saying], Come, and let us join ourselves to Jahveh by an eternal covenant [which] shall not be forgotten. Ver. 6. My people have been a flock of lost ones; their shepherds have misled them [on] mountains which lead astray: from mountain to hill they went; they forgot their resting-place. Ver. 7. All who found them have devoured them; and their enemies said, We are not guilty, for they have sinned against Jahveh, the dwelling-place of justice, and the hope of their fathers, Jahveh. Ver. 8. Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and from the land of the Chaldeans; let

them go forth, and let them be like he-goats before a flock. Ver. 9. For, behold, I will stir up, and bring up against Babylon, an assembly of great nations out of the land of the north: and they shall array themselves against her; on that side shall she be taken: his arrows [are] like [those of] a skilful hero [who] does not return empty. Ver. 10. And [the land of the] Chaldeans shall become a spoil; all those who spoil her shall be satisfied, saith Jahveh."

In the spirit Jeremiah sees the fall of Babylon, together with its idols, as if it had actually taken place, and gives the command to proclaim among the nations this event, which brings deliverance for Israel and Judah. The joy over this is expressed in the accumulation of the words for the summons to tell the nations what has happened. On the expression, cf. iv. 5, 6, xlvi. 14. The lifting up of a standard, *i.e.* of a signal-rod, served for the more rapid spreading of news; cf. iv. 6, vi. 1, Isa. xiii. 2, etc. "Cause it to be heard" is intensified by the addition of "do not conceal it." The thing is to be proclaimed without reserve; cf. xxxviii. 14. "Babylon is taken," *i.e.* conquered, and her idols have become ashamed, inasmuch as, from their inability to save their city, their powerlessness and nullity have come to light. Bel and Merodach are not different divinities, but merely different names for the chief deity of the Babylonians. Bel = Baal, the Jupiter of the Babylonians, was, as Bel-Merodach, the tutelary god of Babylon. "The whole of the Babylonian dynasty," says Oppert, *Expéd. en Mésopot.* ii. p. 272, "places him [Merodach] at the head of the gods; and the inscription of Borsippa calls him the king of heaven and earth." עֲצָבִים, "images of idols," and גָּלְלִים, properly "logs," an expression of contempt for idols (see on Lev. xxvi. 30), are synonymous ideas for designating the nature and character of the Babylonian gods.—Ver. 3. Babylon is fallen by a people from the north, that has gone out against her, and makes her land a desolation. This nation is described in ver. 9 as a collection, union of great nations, that are enumerated especially in li. 27, 28. On "it [the nation] shall make her land," etc., cf. ii. 15, xlvi. 9; on the expression "from man to beast," cf. xxxiii. 12, ix. 9. נָרָג is from נָרָג, ver. 8 and xlvi. 30 = נָרָג, ix. 9.—Ver. 4 f. Then, when Babylon shall

have fallen, the children of Israel and Judah return out of their captivity, seeking Jahveh their God with tears of repentance, and marching to Zion, for the purpose of joining themselves to Him in an eternal covenant. The fall of Babylon has the deliverance of Israel as its direct result. The prophet views this in such a way, that all the steps in the fulfilment (the return from Babylon, the reunion of the tribes previously separated, their sincere return to the Lord, and the making of a new covenant that shall endure for ever), which will actually follow successively in long periods, are taken together into one view. By the statement made regarding the time, "In those days, and at that time," the fall of Babylon and the deliverance of Israel (which Jeremiah sees in the spirit as already begun) are marked out as belonging to the future. Israel and Judah come together, divided no more; cf. iii. 18. "Going and weeping they go," *i.e.* they always go further on, weeping: cf. xli. 6; 2 Sam. iii. 16; Ewald, § 280, *b*. Cf. also iii. 21, xxxi. 9. Seeking the Lord their God, they ask for Zion, *i.e.* they ask after the way thither; for in Zion Jahveh has His throne. "The way hither" (*i.e.* to Jerusalem) "is their face," *sc.* directed. "Hither" points to the place of the speaker, Jerusalem. פָּגַע וְנִלְלֵנָה are imperatives, and words with which those who are returning encourage one another to a close following of the Lord their God. נִלְלֵנָה is imperative for יִלְלֵנָה, like נִקְבְּצֵנָה in Isa. xlivi. 9, Joel iv. 11; cf. Ewald, § 226, *c*. It cannot be the imperfect, because the third person gives no sense; hence Graf would change the vowels, and read נִלְלֵנָה. But suspicion is raised against this by the very fact that, excepting Eccles. viii. 15, לְלֵנָה, in the sense of joining oneself to, depending on, occurs only in the Niphal. בְּרִית עַזְמָה is a modal accusative: "in an eternal covenant [which] shall not be forgotten," *i.e.* which we will not forget, will not break again. In fact, this is the new covenant which the Lord, according to xxxi. 31 ff., will make in time to come with His people. But here this side of the matter is withdrawn from consideration; for the point treated of is merely what Israel, in his repentant frame and returning to God, vows he shall do.

Israel comes to this determination in consequence of the misery into which he has fallen because of his sins, vers. 5-7.

Israel was like a flock of lost sheep which their shepherds had led astray. **צָאן אָבָרוֹת**, a flock of sheep that are going to ruin. The participle in the plural is joined with the collective noun *ad sensum*, to show what is imminent or is beginning to happen. The verb **הִיּוּ** points to the subject **צָאן**; hence the *Qeri* **הִי** is unnecessary. The plural suffixes of the following clause refer to **עַמִּי** as a collective. The shepherds led the people of God astray on **הַרִּים שׁוֹבְבִים** (a local accusative; on the *Kethib* **שׁוֹבְבִים**, cf. xxxi. 32, xlix. 4; it is not to be read **שׁוֹבְבִים**), mountains that render people faithless. These mountains were so designated because they were the seats of that idolatry which had great power of attraction for a sinful people, so that the seduction or alienation of the people from their God is ascribed to them. **שׁוֹבֵב** is used in the sense which the verb has in Isa. xlvi. 10. The *Qeri* **שׁוֹבְבִים** gives the less appropriate idea, “the shepherds made the sheep stray.” Hitzig’s translation, “they drove them along the mountain,” does not suit the verb **שׁוֹבֵב**. Moreover, the mountains in themselves do not form unsuitable pasture-ground for sheep, and **הַרִּים** does not mean “a bare, desolate mountain-range.” The objection to our view of **הַרִּים שׁוֹבְבִים**, that there is no very evident proof that worship on high places is referred to (Graf), is pure fancy, and the reverse only is true. For the words which follow, “they (the sheep) went from mountain to hill, and forgot their resting-place,” have no meaning whatever, unless they are understood of the idolatrous dealings of Israel. The resting-place of the sheep (**רֶבֶץ**, the place where the flocks lie down to rest), according to ver. 7, is Jahveh, the hope of their fathers. Their having forgotten this resting-place is the result of their going from mountain to hill: these words undeniably point to the idolatry of the people on every high hill (ii. 20, iii. 2, xvii. 2, etc.).—Ver. 7. The consequence of this going astray on the part of Israel was, that every one who found them devoured them, and while doing so, cherished the thought that they were not incurring guilt, because Israel had been given up to their enemies on account of their apostasy from God; while the fact was, that every offence against Israel, as the holy people of the Lord, brought on guilt; cf. ii. 3. This befell Israel because they have sinned against Jahveh. **נוֹהַ צָרָק**, “the habitation (or pasture-ground)

of righteousness." So, in xxxi. 23, Zion is called the mountain on which Jahveh sits enthroned in His sanctuary. As in other places Jahveh Himself is called a fortress, Ps. xviii. 3; a sun, shield, Ps. lxxxiv. 12; a shade, Ps. cxxi. 5; so here He is called the One in whom is contained that righteousness which is the source of Israel's salvation. As such, He was the hope of the fathers, the God upon whom the fathers put their trust; cf. xiv. 8, xvii. 13, Ps. xxii. 5 f. The repetition of יהוה at the end is intended to give an emphatic conclusion to the sentence.— Vers. 8-10. To escape from this misery, Israel is to flee from Babylon; for the judgment of conquest and plunder by enemies is breaking over Babylon. The summons to flee out of Babylon is a reminiscence of Isa. xlvi. 20. The *Kethib* יְצַאֵי may be vindicated, because the direct address pretty often makes a sudden transition into the language of the third person. They are to depart from the land of the Chaldeans. No more will then be necessary than to change into וְיַעֲזֹבְנִי. The simile, "like he-goats before the flock," does not mean that Israel is to press forward that he may save himself before any one else (Graf), but that Israel is to go before all, as an example and leader in the flight (Nägelsbach). — Ver. 9. For the Lord arouses and leads against Babylon a crowd of nations, *i.e.* an army consisting of a multitude of nations. As מַעַיר reminds us of Isa. xiii. 17, so קָהֵל גּוֹיִם קָלִים remind us of in Isa. xiii. 4. עֲרֵךְ לְ, to make preparations against. מִלְּשָׁם is not used of time (Rosenmüller, Nägelsbach, etc.), for this application of the word has not been established from the actual occurrence of instances, but it has a local meaning, and refers to the "crowd of nations:" from that place where the nations that come out of the north have assembled before Babylon. In the last clause, the multitude of great nations is taken together, as if they formed one enemy: "his arrows are like [the arrows] of a wisely dealing (*i.e.* skilful) warrior."¹ The

¹ Instead of מִשְׁפֵּל, J. H. Michaelis, in his *Biblia Halens.*, has accepted the reading מִשְׁפֵּל on the authority of three Erfurt codices and three old editions (a Veneta of 1618; Buxtorf's Rabbinic Bible, printed at Basle, 1620; and the London Polyglott). J. D. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Umbreit have decided for this reading, and point to the rendering of the Vulgate, *interfectoris*, and of the Targum, מִחְפֵּל, *orbans*. On the

words נַיְשֵׁב רִקְםָן do not permit of being referred, on the strength of 2 Sam. i. 22, to one particular arrow which does not come back empty ; for the verb שָׁבַב, though perhaps suitable enough for the sword, which is drawn back when it has executed the blow, is inappropriate for the arrow, which does not return. The subject to נַיְשֵׁב is גָּבוֹר, the hero, who does not turn or return without having accomplished his object; cf. Isa. lv. 11. In ver. 10, בְּשָׁדִים is the name of the country, "Chaldeans;" hence it is construed as a feminine. The plunderers of Chaldea will be able to satisfy themselves with the rich booty of that country.

Vers. 11-20. *The devastation of Babylon and glory of Israel.*
 —Ver. 11. "Though ye rejoice, though ye exult, O ye plunderers of mine inheritance, though ye leap proudly like a heifer threshing, and neigh like strong horses, Ver. 12. Your mother will be very much ashamed ; she who bare you will blush : behold, the last of the nations [will be] a wilderness, a desert, and a steppe. Ver. 13. Because of the indignation of Jahveh it shall not be inhabited, and it shall become a complete desolation. Every one passing by Babylon will be astonished, and hiss because of all her plagues. Ver. 14. Make preparations against Babylon round about, all ye that bend the bow ; shoot at her, do not spare an arrow, for she hath sinned against Jahveh. Ver. 15. Shout against her round about ; she hath given herself up : her battlements are fallen, her walls are pulled down ; for it is Jahveh's vengeance : revenge yourselves on her ; as she hath done, do ye to her. Ver. 16. Cut off the sower from Babylon, and him that handles the sickle in the time of harvest. From before the oppressing sword each one will turn to his own nation, and each one will flee to his own land. Ver. 17. Israel is a scattered sheep [which] lions have driven away : the first [who] devoured him [was] the other hand, the LXX. and Syriac have read and rendered מְשֻׁבֵּל ; and this reading is not merely presented by *nonnulli libri*, as Maurer states, but by twelve codices of de Rossi, and all the more ancient editions of the Bible, of which de Rossi in his *variae lectiones* mentions forty-one. The critical witnesses are thus overwhelming for מְשֻׁבֵּל ; and against מְשֻׁבֵּל there lies the further consideration, that שְׁבֵל has the meaning *orbare*, to render childless, only in the Piel, but in the Hiphil means *abortare*, to cause or have miscarriages, as is shown by רְחֵם מְשֻׁבֵּל, Hos. ix. 14.

king of Babylon ; and this, the last, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, hath broken his bones. Ver. 18. Therefore thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel : Behold, I will punish the king of Babylon and his land, as I have punished the king of Assyria. Ver. 19. And I will bring back Israel to his pasture-ground, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan, and on the mountains of Ephraim his soul shall be satisfied. Ver. 20. In those days, and at that time, saith Jahveh, the iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, but it shall not be ; and the sins of Judah, but they shall not be found : for I will pardon those whom I will leave remaining."

Ver. 11 does not permit of being so closely connected with what precedes as to separate it from ver. 12 (De Wette, Nägelsbach). Not only is the translation, "for thou didst rejoice," etc., difficult to connect with the imperfects of all the verbs in the verse, but the direct address also does not suit ver. 10, and rather demands connection with ver. 12, where it is continued. 'בַּ, of course, introduces the reason, yet not in such a way that ver. 11 states the cause why Chaldea shall become a spoil, but rather so that vers. 11 and 12 together give the reason for the threatening uttered. The different clauses of ver. 11 are the protases, to which ver. 12 brings the apodosis. "You may go on making merry over the defeat of Israel, but shame will follow for this." The change of the singular forms of the verbs into plurals (*Qeri*) has been caused by the plural 'בָּשָׂר', but is unnecessary, because Babylon is regarded as a collective, and its people are gathered into the unity of a person ; see on xiii. 20. "Spoilers of mine inheritance," *i.e.* of the people and land of the Lord ; cf. xii. 7, Isa. xvii. 14. On 'בַּפְּ, to gallop (of a horse, Hab. i. 8), hop, spring (of a calf, Mal. iii. 20), see on Hab. i. 8. 'אֶלְעָזָר is rendered by the LXX. *ἐν βοτάνῃ*, by the Vulgate *super herbam* ; after these, Ewald also takes the meaning of springing like a calf through the grass, since he explains 'אֶלְעָזָר as exhibiting the correct punctuation, and remarks that 'בַּפְּ, like 'לְלָבָן, can stand with an object directly after it ; see § 282, *a*. Most modern expositors, on the other hand, take 'אֶלְעָזָר as the fem. participle from 'גַּזֵּשׁ, written with נ instead of נ : "like a threshing heifer." On this, A. Schultens, in his *Animadv. philol.*, on this passage, remarks : *Comparatio petita*

est a vitula, quæ in area media inter frumenta, ore ex lege non ligato (Deut. xxv. 10), *præ pabuli abundantia gestit ex exsultat.* This explanation also gives a suitable meaning, without compelling us to do violence to the language and to alter the text. As to אֲבִירִים, stallions, strong horses (Luther), see on viii. 16 and xlvi. 3. "Your mother" is the whole body of the people, the nation considered as a unity (cf. Isa. l. 1, Hos. ii. 4, iv. 5), the individual members of which are called her sons; cf. v. 7, etc. In ver. 12b, the disgrace that is to fall on Babylon is more distinctly specified. The thought is gathered up into a sententious saying, in imitation of the sayings of Balaam. "The last of the nations" is the antithesis of "the first of the nations," as Balaam calls Amalek, Num. xxiv. 20, because they were the first heathen nation that began to fight against the people of Israel. In like manner, Jeremiah calls Babylon the last of the heathen nations. As the end of Amalek is ruin (Num. xxiv. 20), so the end of the last heathen nation that comes forward against Israel will be a wilderness, desert, steppe. The predicates (cf. ii. 6) refer to the country and kingdom of Babylon. But if the end of the kingdom is a desert, then the people must have perished. The devastation of Babylon is further portrayed in ver. 13, together with a statement of the cause: "Because of the anger of Jahveh it shall not be inhabited;" cf. Isa. xiii. 20. The words *from hence* onwards are imitated from xlix. 17 and xix. 8.—Ver. 14. In order to execute this judgment on Babylon, the nations are commanded to conquer and destroy the city. The archers are to place themselves round about Babylon, and shoot at the city unsparingly. עֲרֵך does not mean to prepare oneself, but to prepare מִלחָמָה, the battle, combat. The archers are mentioned by synecdoche, because the point in question is the siege and bombardment of Babylon; cf. Isa. xiii. 18, where the Medes are mentioned as archers. יְרֵה is used only here, in Kal, of the throwing, i.e. the shooting of arrows, instead of יְרַה, which is elsewhere the usual word for this; and, indeed, some codices have the latter word in this passage. "Spare not the arrow," i.e. do not spare an arrow; cf. li. 3. עָרֵעַ, to cry aloud; here, to raise a battle-cry; cf. Josh. vi. 16. The effect and result of the cry is, "she hath given her hand," i.e. given herself up. נָתַן יָד usually

signifies the giving of the hand as a pledge of faithfulness (2 Kings x. 15; Ezek. xvii. 18; Ezra x. 19), from which is derived the meaning of giving up, delivering up oneself; cf. 2 Chron. xxx. 8. Cf. Cornelius Nepos, *Hamilec.* c. 1, *donec victi manum deditissent.* The ἄπ. λεγ. אֲשִׁוּתָה (the *Kethib* is either to be read אֲשִׁוּתָה אֲשִׁוּתָה, as if from a noun אֲשִׁוּתָה, or to be viewed as an error in transcription for אֲשִׁוּתָה, which is the *Qeri*) signifies

“supports,” and comes from אָשָׁה, לְאָשָׁה, to support, help; then the supports of a building, its foundations; cf. אֲשִׁוּתָה, Ezra iv. 12. Here the word signifies the supports of the city, i.e. the fortifications of Babylon, ἐπάλξεις, *propugnacula*, *pinnæ*, the battlements of the city wall, not the foundations of the walls, for which נִפְלָאָה is unsuitable. “It (sc. the destruction of Babylon) is the vengeance of Jahveh.” “The vengeance of Jahveh” is an expression derived from Num. xxxi. 3. “Avenge yourselves on her,” i.e. take retribution for what Babylon has done to other nations, especially to the people of God; cf. 28 f. and li. 11. The words, “cut off out of Babylon the sower and the reaper,” are not to be restricted to the fields, which, according to the testimonies of Diod. Sic. ii. 7, Pliny xviii. 17, and Curtius v. 1, lay within the wall round Babylon, but “Babylon” is the province together with its capital; and the objection of Nägelsbach, that the prophet, in the whole context, is describing the siege of the city of Babylon, is invalid, because ver. 12b plainly shows that not merely the city, but the province of Babylon, is to become a wilderness, desert, and steppe. The further threat, also, “every ones flees to his own people from before the oppressing sword” (cf. xxv. 38, xlvi. 16), applies not merely to the strangers residing in Babylon, but generally to those in Babylonia. Hitzig would arbitrarily refer these words merely to the husbandmen and field-workers. The fundamental passage, Isa. xiii. 14, which Jeremiah had before his mind and repeats *verbatim*, tells decidedly against this view; cf. also Jer. li. 9, 44.—Vers. 17-19. This judgment comes on Babylon because of her oppression and scattering of the people of Israel, whom the Lord will now feed in peace again on their native soil. Israel is like פָּנָרָה שֶׁ, a sheep which, having been scared away out of its stall or fold, is hunted into the wide

world ; cf. פִּירֵי בָּנֹוִים, Joel iv. 2. Although פִּירֵי, "to scatter," implies the conception of a flock, yet we cannot take שָׁנִים as a collective (Graf), since it is *nomen unitatis*. The point in the comparison lies on the fact that Israel has been hunted, like a solitary sheep, up and down among the beasts of the earth ; and פִּירֵי is more exactly specified by the following clause, "lions have chased after it." The object of הַרְיָה is easily derived from the context, so that we do not need to follow Hitzig in changing הַרְיָה רָאשׁוֹן into הַרְיָה רָאשׁוֹן. These kings are, the king of Assyria first, and the king of Babylon last. The former has dispersed the ten tribes among the heathen ; the latter, by destroying the kingdom of Judah, and carrying away its inhabitants, has shattered the theocracy. The verbs apply to the figure of the lion, and the suffixes refer to Israel. אָכַל is used of the devouring of the flesh ; עָם is a *denominative* from עָם, and means the same as פְּרָם, Num. xxiv. 8, to break bones in pieces, not merely gnaw them. So long as the flesh only is eaten, the skeleton of bones remains ; if these also be broken, the animal is quite destroyed.—Ver. 18. The Assyrian has already received his punishment for that—the Assyrian kingdom has been destroyed ; Babylon will meet with the same punishment, and then (ver. 19) Israel will be led back to his pasture-ground. נֶהָרָה, pasture-ground, grass-plot, where sheep feed, is the land of Israel. Israel, led back thither, will feed on Carmel and Bashan, the most fertile tracts of the country, and the mountains of Ephraim and Gilead, which also furnish fodder in abundance for sheep. As to Gilead, see Num. xxxii. 1, Mic. vii. 14 ; and in regard to the mountains of Ephraim, Ex. xxxiv. 13 f., where the feeding on the mountains of Israel and in the valleys is depicted as fat pasture. The mountains of Israel here signify the northern portion of the land generally, including the large and fertile plain of Jezreel, and the different valleys between the several ranges of mountains, which here and there show traces of luxuriant vegetation even yet ; cf. Robinson's *Physical Geography*, p. 120. Then also the guilt of the sins of Israel and Judah shall be blotted out, because the Lord grants pardon to the remnant of His people. This promise points to the time of the New Covenant ; cf. xxxi. 34 and xxxiii. 8. The deliverance of Israel from Babylon coincides

with the view given of the regeneration of the people by the Messiah, just as we find throughout the second portion of Isaiah. On the construction 'יבקש אֶת־עַזָּן יְשָׁרָם', cf. xxxv. 14, and Gesenius, § 143, 1. On the form **תִּפְצַרְתִּי**, with ' after the manner of verbs **הָלַל**, cf. Ewald, § 198, b.

Vers. 21-28. The pride and power of Babylon are broken, as a punishment for the sacrilege he committed at the temple of the Lord. Ver. 21. "Against the land,—Double-rebellion,—go up against it, and against the inhabitants of visitation ; lay waste and devote to destruction after them, saith Jahveh, and do according to all that I have commanded thee. Ver. 22. A sound of war [is] in the land, and great destruction. Ver. 23. How the hammer of the whole earth is cut and broken ! how Babylon has become a desolation among the nations ! Ver. 24. I laid snares for thee, yea, and thou hast been taken, O Babylon ; but thou didst not know : thou wast found, and also seized, because thou didst strive against Jahveh. Ver. 25. Jahveh hath opened His treasure-house, and brought out the instruments of His wrath ; for the Lord, Jahveh of hosts, hath a work in the land of the Chaldeans. Ver. 26. Come against her, [all of you], from the last [to the first] ; open her store-houses : cast her up in heaps, like ruins, and devote her to destruction ; let there be no remnant left to her. Ver. 27. Destroy all her oxen ; let them go down to the slaughter : woe to them ! for their day is come, the time of their visitation. Ver. 28. [There is] a sound of those who flee and escape out of the land of Babylon, to declare in Zion the vengeance of Jahveh our God, the vengeance of His temple."

The punishment of Babylon will be fearful, corresponding to its crimes. The crimes of Babylon and its punishment Jeremiah has comprised, in ver. 21, in two names specially formed for the occasion. The enemy to whom God has entrusted the execution of the punishment is to march against the land **מִרְתִּים**. This word, which is formed by the prophet in a manner analogous to *Mizraim*, and perhaps also *Aram Naharaim*, means "double rebellion," or "double obstinacy." It comes from the root **מִרְתָּה**, "to be rebellious" against Jahveh and His commandments, whence also **מִרְיָה**, "rebellion ;" Num. xvii. 25, Ezek. ii. 5, 7, etc. Other interpretations of the

word are untenable: such is that of Fürst, who follows the Vulgate “*terram dominantium*,” and, comparing the Aramaic מֶרֶה, “Lord,” renders it by “dominion” (*Herrschaft*). Utterly indefensible, too, is the translation of Hitzig, “the world of men” (*Menschenwelt*), which he derives from the Sanskrit *martjam*, “world,” on the basis of the false assumption that the language of the Chaldeans was Indo-Germanic. The only doubtful points are in what respect Babylon showed double obstinacy, and what Jeremiah had in his mind at the time. The view of Hitzig, Maurer, Graf, etc., is certainly incorrect,—that the prophet was thinking of the double punishment of Israel by the Assyrians and by the Babylonians (vers. 17 and 33); for the name is evidently given to the country which is now about to be punished, and hence to the power of Babylon. Nägelsbach takes a twofold view: (1) he thinks of the defiance shown by Babylon towards both man and God; (2) he thinks of the double obstinacy it exhibited in early times by building the tower, and founding the first worldly kingdom (Gen. x. 8 f.), and in later times by its conduct towards the theocracy: and he is inclined rather to the latter than to the former view, because the offences committed by Babylon in early and in later times were, in their points of origin and aim, too much one and the same for any one to be able to represent them as falling under two divisions. This is certainly correct; but against the first view there is also the important consideration that מֶרֶה is pretty constantly used only of opposition to God and the word of God. If any one, notwithstanding this, is inclined to refer the name also to offences against men, he could yet hardly agree with Nägelsbach in thinking of the insurrections of Babylon against the kings of Assyria, their masters; for these revolts had no meaning in reference to the position of Babylon towards God, but rather showed the haughty spirit in which Babylon trod on all the nations. The opinion of Dahler has most in its favour: “Doubly rebellious, *i.e.* more rebellious than others, through its idolatry and its pride, which has exalted it against God, vers. 24, 29.” Rosenmüller, De Wette, etc., have decided in favour of this view. Although the dual originally expresses the idea of pairing, yet the Hebrew associates with *double, twofold*, the

idea of increase, gradation; cf. Isa. xl. 2, lxi. 7. The object is prefixed for the sake of emphasis; and in order to render it still more prominent, it is resumed after the verb in the expression “against it.” פָּקֹד, an infinitive in form, “to visit with punishment, avenge, punish,” is also used as a significant name of Babylon: the land that visits with punishment is to be punished. Many expositors take חַרְבָּה as a denominative from חַרְבָּה, “sword,” in the sense of strangling, murdering; so also in ver. 27. But this assumption is far from correct; nor is there any need for making it, because the meaning of destroying is easily obtained from that of being laid waste, or destroying oneself by transferring the word from things to men. חַרְמִים, “to proscribe, put under the ban,” and in effect “to exterminate;” see on xxv. 9. On “after them,” cf. xl ix. 37, xl viii. 2, 9, 15, etc.—Ver. 22. After the command there immediately follows its execution. A sound of war is heard in the land. The words are given as an exclamation, without a verb. As to פָּרֹלֶשׁ, which is an expression much used by Jeremiah, see on iv. 6.—Ver. 23. Babylon, “the hammer of the whole earth,” i.e. with which Jahveh has beaten to pieces the nations and kingdoms of the earth (li. 20), is itself now being beaten to pieces and destroyed. On the subject, cf. Isa. xiv. 5, 6. Babylon will become the astonishment of the nations, li. 41. “How!” is an exclamation of surprise, as in Zeph. ii. 15, —a passage which probably hovered before the mind of the prophet.—Ver. 24. This annihilation will come unexpectedly. As the bird by the snare of the fowler, so shall Babylon be laid hold of by Jahveh, because it has striven against Him. The Lord lays the snare for it, that it may be caught. שָׁקַד, “to lay snares;” cf. Ps. cxli. 9, where חַדָּה is also found. וְלֹא יָמַדְתָּ, “and thou didst not perceive,” i.e. didst not mark it: this is a paraphrase of the idea “unexpectedly,” suddenly; cf. li. 8, Isa. xl vii. 11. This has been literally fulfilled on Babylon. According to Herodotus (i. 191), Cyrus took Babylon by diverting the Euphrates into a trench he had dug. By this stratagem the Persians threw themselves so unexpectedly on the Babylonians (ἐξ ἀπροσδοκήτου σφι παρέστησαν οἱ Πέρσαι), that when the outmost portions of the city had been already seized, those who lived in the middle had not

observed at all that they were captured (*τοὺς τὸ μέσον οἰκέοντας οὐ μανθάνειν ἑαλωκότας*). Similarly, when the city was taken under Darius Hystaspes, they were surprised that Zopyrus traitorously opened the gates to the besiegers (Herodotus, iii. 158). Babylon has contended against Jahveh, because, in its pride, it refused to let the people of God depart; cf. vers. 29 and 33. In ver. 25 the sudden devastation of Babylon is accounted for. Jahveh opens His armoury, and brings out the instruments of His wrath, in order to execute His work on the land of the Chaldeans. **אָזֶר**, “magazine, treasure-chamber,” is here applied to an armoury. The “instruments of His wrath” are, in Isa. xiii. 5, the nations which execute the judgment of God,—here, the instruments of war and weapons with which Jahveh Himself marches into battle against Babylon. On **מִלְאָכָה וּמִלְאָכָה**, cf. xlvi. 10. The business which the Lord has there regards the chastisement of Babylon for its insolence. For the transaction of this business He summons His servants, ver. 26 f. **בְּאַלְמָנָה**, as in xlvi. 22, xlix. 9, is substantially the same as **בְּאַלְמָנָה**, xlix. 14, xlvi. 8. **אַתְּ**, “from the end,” or from the last hitherwards, the same as **מִקְצָה**, li. 31, i.e. all together on to the last; cf. Gen. xix. 4, xlvi. 2, etc. “Open her (Babylon’s) barns” or granaries; “heap it up (viz. what was in the granaries) like heaps” of grain or sheaves, “and devote it to destruction,” i.e. consume it with fire, because things on which the curse was imposed must be burnt; cf. Josh. xi. 12 and 13. All the property found in Babylon is to be collected in heaps, and then burnt with the city. The use of the image is occasioned by the granaries. **מַאֲבָסִית** is *ἄπ.* **λεύ.**, from **אָבֵס**, to give fodder to cattle,—properly a stall for fodder, then a barn, granary. **עֲרָמָה** is a heap of grain (Cant. vii. 3), sheaves (Ruth iii. 7), also of rubbish (Neh. iii. 34). As ver. 26 declares what is to be done with goods and chattels, so does ver. 27 state what is to be done with the population. The figure employed in ver. 26 is followed by the representation of the people as oxen destined for slaughter; in this Jeremiah had in his mind the prophecy found in Isa. xxxiv., in which the judgment to come on Edom is depicted as a slaughter of lambs, rams, and he-goats: the people of Edom are thus compared to cattle that may be offered in sacrifice. This figure

also forms the basis of the expression יְמֵד לְפָנֶה in xlvi. 15, where this style of speaking is used with regard to the youths or the young troops; cf. also li. 40. The בָּנִים, accordingly, designate not merely the chief among the people, or the men of rank, but represent the whole human population. In the last clause ("for their day is come," etc.), there is a transition in the discourse from the figure to the real subject itself. The suffix in עַלְיָהֶם does not refer to the oxen, but to the men over whose murder there is an exclamation of woe. In like manner, "their day" means the day of judgment for men, viz. the time of their visitation with punishment; see on xlvi. 21. Fugitives and escaped ones will bring to Zion, and proclaim the news of the execution of this fearful judgment, that the Lord has fulfilled the vengeance of His temple, *i.e.* avenged on Babylon the burning of His temple by the Chaldeans. The fugitives and escaped ones are the Israelites, who were summoned to flee from Babylon, ver. 3. On "the vengeance of Jahveh," cf. ver. 15 and li. 11.

Vers. 29-40. The pride of Babylon is humbled through the utter destruction of the people and the land.—Ver. 29. "Summon archers against Jerusalem, all those who bend the bow; encamp against her round about. Let there be no escape for her; recompense to her according to her work; according to that which she hath done, do ye to her: for she hath presumed against Jahveh, against the Holy One of Israel. Ver. 30. Therefore shall her young men fall in her streets, and all her men of war shall fail in that day, saith Jahveh. Ver. 31. Behold, I am against thee, O Pride! saith the Lord, Jahveh of hosts; for thy day hath come, the time [when] I visit thee. Ver. 32. And Pride shall stumble and fall, and he shall have none to lift him up; and I will kindle fire in his cities, and it shall devour all that is round about him. Ver. 33. Thus saith Jahveh of hosts, The children of Israel and the children of Judah are oppressed together, and all who led them captive kept hold of them; they refused to let them go. Ver. 34. Their Redeemer is strong; Jahveh of hosts is His name: He shall surely plead their cause, that He may give rest to the earth, and make the inhabitants of Babylon tremble. Ver. 35. A sword [is] against the Chaldeans, saith Jahveh, and against

the inhabitants of Babylon, and against her princes, and against her wise men. Ver. 36. A sword [is] against the liars, and they shall become fools ; a sword [is] against her heroes, and they shall be confounded. Ver. 37. A sword is against his horses, and against his chariots, and against all the auxiliaries which [are] in the midst of her, and they shall become women ; a sword is against her treasures, and they shall be plundered. Ver. 38. A drought is against her waters, and they shall become dry ; for it is a land of graven images, and they are mad upon idols. Ver. 39. Therefore shall wild beasts dwell [there] with jackals, and ostriches shall dwell in it ; and it shall no more be inhabited for ever, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation. Ver. 40. As God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah and their inhabitants, saith Jahveh, no man shall dwell there, nor shall a son of man sojourn in it."

Further description of the execution of God's wrath. Archers shall come and besiege Babylon round about, so that no one shall escape. The summons, "Call archers hither," is a dramatic turn in the thought that the siege is quickly to ensue. **עֲשֵׂה** is used here as in li. 27, to summon, call by making proclamation, as in 1 Kings xv. 22. **רְבִים** does not signify "many," as the ancient versions give it ; this agrees neither with the apposition which follows, "all that bend the bow," nor with ver. 26, where all, to the last, are summoned against Babylon. Raschi, followed by all the moderns, more correctly renders it "archers," and derives it from **רְבֵב**, Gen. xlix. 23, cf. with xxi. 10, like **רְבָב**, Job xvi. 13. The apposition, "all those who bend the bow," gives additional force. **חַנָּה** with accus. means to besiege ; cf. Ps. liii. 6. "Let there be no escape" is equivalent to saying, "that none may escape from Babylon." The *Qeri* **מִלְאָךְ** after **תִּלְאָךְ** is unnecessary, and merely taken from ver. 26. On the expression "render to her," etc., cf. xxv. 14 ; and on "according to all," etc., cf. ver. 15. "For she hath acted presumptuously against Jahveh," by burning His temple, and keeping His people captive : in this way has Babylon offended "against the Holy One of Israel." This epithet of God is taken from Isaiah, cf. li. 5. This presumption must be punished.—Ver. 30 is a repetition of xlix. 26.—Ver. 31. The Lord will now visit the presumption of Babylon. The day

of punishment has arrived. On “ behold, I am against thee,” cf. xxi. 13. “ O arrogance, pride ! ” is directly addressed to Babylon : in ver. 32 also there is a like designation of Babylon as the personification of pride. On the words “ for thy day is come,” cf. ver. 27. “ And I will kindle a fire,” etc., stands as in xxi. 14, where, however, “ in its forest ” is found instead of “ in his cities.” The former, indeed, is the reading rendered by the LXX. in this passage ; but they have acted quite arbitrarily in this, since Jeremiah, for the most part, varies individual words when he repeats a thought. “ In his cities ” does not suit very well, inasmuch as the other cities of the country belonged to Babylon, the *μητρόπολις*, as hers, and in li. 43 they are spoken of as hers ; cf. xix. 15, xxxiv. 1, xlix. 13, etc.—Vers. 33–40. Further description of the guilt and punishment of Babylon. The presumptuous pride manifests itself in the fact that Israel and Judah still languish in exile. All those who have been seized and carried away they have kept hold of. *שִׁבְתָּהֶם* is used as in Isa. xiv. 2. They refuse to let them go, as Pharaoh once did, Ex. vii. 14, 27, ix. 2 ; cf. Isa. xiv. 17. Jahveh, the deliverer of Israel, cannot endure this. As the strong One, the God of hosts, He will lead them in the fight ; as their advocate, He will obtain their dues for them ; cf. xxv. 31, Isa. xlix. 25. Dahler, Ewald, and Umbreit follow the Vulgate and the Chaldee in taking *לְמַעַן חָרְבֵּעַ וְיָוָא* as synonymous with *הָרְבֵּי*, in the sense of shaking, rousing, a meaning which *רָנַע* has in the Kal, but which cannot be made out for the Hiphil. In the Hiphil it means to give rest, to come to rest, Deut. xxviii. 65, Isa. xxxiv. 14, lxi. 4, Jer. xxxi. 2 ; and in the Niphal, to rest, keep quiet, xlvi. 6. This is the meaning given by the Syriac, Raschi, Kimchi, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig, etc., and supported by a comparison with Isa. xiv. 7, 3, 16. Babylon has hitherto kept the earth in unrest and anxiety (Isa. xiv. 16) ; now it is to get rest (Isa. xiv. 3, 7), and trembling or quaking for fear is to come on Babylon. The two verbs, which have similar sounds, express a contrast. On the form of the infinitive *הָרְגֵּעַ*, cf. Ewald, § 238, d. In order to conduct the case of Israel as against Babylon, the Lord (vers. 35–38) calls for the sword against the Chaldeans, the inhabitants of Babylon, on their princes, wise men, heroes, and the whole army, the

treasures and the waters. There is no verb following **חרב**, but only the object with **ל**, the words being put in the form of an exclamation, on account of the passion pervading them. The sword is to come and show its power on the Chaldeans, *i.e.* the population of the rural districts, on the inhabitants of the capital, and further, on the princes and wise men (magicians). A special class of the last named are the **בְּרִים**, properly “babblers,” those who talk at random, here “soothsayers” and lying prophets, the astrologers of Babylon; see Delitzsch on Isa. xliv. 25 [Clark’s translation, For. Theol. Lib.]. **וְנִנְאַלְּה**, “And they shall be as fools;” see on v. 4. Further, on the warriors, the horses, and war-chariots, the main strength of the Asiatic conquerors, cf. xlvi. 9, Isa. xliv.¹⁷ Ps. xx. 8. **בְּלִיחָעָב**, “all the mixed multitude” in the midst of Babylon: these are here the mercenaries and allies (as to this word, see on xxv. 20). These shall become women, *i.e.* weak and incapable of resistance; see Nah. iii. 13. The last objects of vengeance are the treasures and the waters of Babylon. In ver. 38 the Masoretes have pointed **חרַב**, because **חרב**, “sword,” seemed to be inapplicable to the waters. But indeed neither does the sword, in the proper sense of the word, well apply to treasures; it rather stands, by synecdoche, for war. In this improper meaning it might also be used with reference to the waters, in so far as the canals and watercourses, on which the fertility of Babylonia depended, were destroyed by war. Hence many expositors would read **חרַב** here also, and attribute the employment of this word to the rhetorical power connected with enumeration. Others are of opinion that **חרב** may also mean aridity, drought, in Deut. xxviii. 22; but the assumption is erroneous, and cannot be confirmed by that passage. Neither can it be denied, that to confine the reference of the expression “her waters” to the canals and artificial watercourses of Babylonia seems unnatural. All these received their water from the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, the volume of water in which remained uninfluenced by war. We therefore follow Hitzig in holding that **חרב** is the correct punctuation; in the transition from **חרב** into **בְּרִבָּה**, with its similar sound, we neither perceive any injury done to rhetorical force, derived from an enumeration of objects, nor any need for referring the following clause, which

assigns the reason merely to such rhetorical considerations as Graf does. In the drying up of the water there is no allusion to the diversion of the Euphrates, by which Cyrus opened up for himself an entrance into the city (Herodotus, i. 190); the drying up is merely appointed by God, as a consequence of continued drought, for the purpose of destroying the land. Hitzig's opinion neither suits the context, nor can be justified otherwise; he holds that water is the emblem of the sea of nations, the surging multitude of people in the streets of the city, and he refers for proof to li. 36 and Isa. xxi. 1 (!). The clauses in ver. 38b, which assign the reason, refer to the whole threatening, vers. 35-38a. Babylon is to be destroyed, with its inhabitants and all its means of help, because it is a land of idols (cf. li. 52 and Isa. xxi. 9), and its inhabitants suffer themselves to be befooled by false gods. **הַתְּהִלֵּל** means to act or behave like a madman, rave, xxv. 16; here, to let oneself be deprived of reason, not (as Graf thinks) to fall into a sacred frenzy. **אֵנִים**, terrors, Ps. lxxxviii. 16; here, objects of fear and horror, *i.e.* idols.—Ver. 39. Therefore shall Babylon become an eternal waste, where none but beasts of the desert find shelter, where no human being dwells. This threat is formed out of reminiscences from Isa. xiii. 20-22 and xxxiv. 14. For **צַיִם** and **אֵנִים**, see on Isa. xxxiv. 14; for **בְּנֹת יִעַנְתָּה**, see on Isa. xiii. 21. The second half of the verse agrees word for word with Isa. xiii. 20a.—Ver. 40 is a repetition of xlix. 18, and in its first half is founded on Isa. xiii. 19.

Ver. 41-*li.* 4. *The agents who execute the judgment.*—Ver. 41. “Behold, a people shall come from the north, and a great nation, and many kings shall be raised up from the most distant sides of the earth. Ver. 42. Bow and javelin shall they seize: they are cruel, and will not pity; their voice shall sound like the sea, and they shall ride upon horses, [each one] arrayed like a man for the battle, against thee, O daughter of Babylon. Ver. 43. The king of Babylon hath heard the report concerning them, and his hands have fallen down: distress hath seized him, writhing pain, like [that of] the woman in childbirth. Ver. 44. Behold, he shall come up like a lion from the glory of Jordan to a habitation of rock; but in a moment will I make them run away from her, and will set

over her him who is chosen : for who is like me, and who will appoint me a time [to plead my defence] ? and what shepherd [is there] that will stand before me ? Ver. 45. Therefore hear ye the counsel of Jahveh which He hath taken against Babylon, and His purposes which He hath purposed against the land of the Chaldeans : Assuredly they shall drag them away, the smallest of the flock ; assuredly [their] habitation shall be astonished at them. Ver. 46. At the cry, ‘Babylon is taken,’ the earth is shaken, and a cry [for help] is heard among the nations.

Chap. li. ver. 1. “Thus saith Jahveh : Behold, I will stir up against Babylon, and against the inhabitants of [as it were] the heart of mine opponents, the spirit of a destroyer. Ver. 2. And I will send against Babylon strangers, and they shall winnow her, and empty her land, because they are against her round about in a day of evil. Ver. 3. Against [him who] bends let the bender bend his bow, and against [him who] lifts up himself in his coat of mail: and do not spare her young men ; devote to destruction all her host, Ver. 4. That slain ones may fall in the land of the Chaldeans, and those that are pierced through in her streets.”

The greater portion of this strophe consists of quotations from former utterances. Vers. 41–43 are taken from vi. 22–24, and vers. 44–46 from xlix. 19–21 ; here they are applied to Babylon. What is said in vi. 22–24 concerning the enemy out of the north who will devastate Judah, is here transferred to the enemy that is to destroy Babylon. For this purpose, after the words “and a great nation,” are added “and many kings,” in order to set forth the hostile army advancing against Babylon as one composed of many nations ; and in consequence of this extension of the subject, the verb יָעַזֵּר is used in the plural, and אָכְזֵר הַמֶּה is changed into אָכְזֵר הַמֶּה. Moreover, the mention of the “daughter of Babylon” instead of the “daughter of Zion” is attended by a change from the directly communicative form of address in the first person (“We have heard,” etc., ver. 43) into the third person (“The king of Babylon hath heard,” etc.). In applying the expressions used in xlix. 19–21 regarding the instrument chosen for the destruction of Edom, to the instrument selected against Babylon (vers. 44–46), the names “Babylon” and “the land

of the Chaldeans" are substituted for "Edom" and "the inhabitants of Teman" (xlix. 20); but beyond this, only the last verse is changed, in accordance with the change of circumstances. The thought that, in consequence of the fall of Edom, the earth trembles, and Edom's cry of anguish is heard on the Red Sea, is intensified thus: by the sound or cry, "Babylon is taken," the earth is shaken, and a cry is heard among the nations. The conquest of Babylon, the mistress of the world, puts the whole world in anxiety and fear, while the effects of Edom's fall extend only to the Red Sea. The *Kethib* אָרַזְעָם, ver. 44, seems to come from the verb יָצַר, in the sense of pushing, so that it is not a mere error in transcription for יָמַרְצָא. Moreover, such changes made on former utterances, when they are repeated and applied to Babylon, show that these verses are not glosses which a reader has written on the margin, and a later copyist inserted into the text, but that Jeremiah himself has applied these earlier words in his address against Babylon. The two passages are not merely quite appropriately arranged beside one another, but even present in their connection a thought which has not hitherto been met with in the address against Babylon, and which does not recur afterwards. The enemy that is to conquer Babylon is certainly pointed out, so early as ver. 9, as an assemblage of great nations out of the north, but not more particularly characterized there; but the nations that are to constitute the hostile army are not further designated till li. 11 and 27 ff. The second quotation, vers. 44-46, adds the new thought that the appearance of this enemy against Babylon is owing to a decree of the Lord, the execution of which no man can prevent, because there is none like Jahveh. The figurative description of the enemy as a lion coming up out of the thicket of reeds at the Jordan, frightening the herd feeding on their pasture-ground, and carrying off the weakly sheep, is appropriate both to Nebuchadnezzar's expedition against Edom, and to the invasion of Babylonia by the Medes and their allies, for the purpose of laying waste the country of the Chaldeans, smiting the inhabitants of Babylon, and conquering it. Even the expression נִיהָ אִתְּנָה permits of being applied to Babylonia, which was protected by its canal system and the strong walls of its capital.

In li. 1-4, the terrible character of the hostile nation is further described. Against Babylon and the inhabitants of Chaldea, God stirs up the “spirit of a destroyer,” viz. a savage nation that will massacre the Chaldeans without pity. לְבָב קָרְבָּן, lit. “the heart of mine adversaries,” is the word בְּשִׁׁירִים, changed, according to the canon *Atbash* (see on xxv. 26), for the purpose of obtaining the important meaning that Chaldea is the centre of God’s enemies. This explanation of the name involves the thought that all enmity against God the Lord culminates in Babylon; on the basis of this representation Babylon is called, Rev. xvii. 5, “the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.” רֹוח מְשֻׁחָה does not mean καύσωνα διαφθείροντα (LXX.), *ventum pestilentem* (Vulgate), “a sharp wind” (Luther), nor, as it is usually translated, “a destroying wind;” for הַעַר רֹוח is nowhere used of the rousing of a wind, but everywhere means “to rouse the spirit of any one,” to stir him up to an undertaking; cf. Hag. i. 14, 1 Chron. v. 56, 2 Chron. xxi. 16, and xxxvi. 22. Jeremiah also employs it thus in ver. 11, and this meaning is quite suitable here also. מְשֻׁחָה is a substantive, as in iv. 7: “the spirit of a destroyer.” The figure of winnowing, which follows in ver. 2, does not by any means necessarily require the meaning “wind,” because the figure contained in the word זָרָה was first called forth by the employment of זָרִים, “strangers” = barbarians. The sending of the זָרִים to Babylon has no connection with the figure of the wind, and it even remains a question whether זָרָה really means here to winnow, because the word is often used of the scattering of a nation, without any reference to the figure of winnowing; cf. Lev. xxvi. 33, Ezek. v. 10, xii. 15, etc., also Jer. xl. 32, 36. However, this thought is suggested by what follows, “they empty her hand,” although the clause which assigns the reason, “because they are against her round about” (cf. iv. 17), does not correspond with this figure, but merely declares that the enemies which attack Babylon on every side disperse its inhabitants and empty the land.—Ver. 3. These strangers shall kill, without sparing, every warrior of Babylon, and annihilate its whole military forces. In the first half of the verse the reading is doubtful, since the Masoretes would have the second יְדָרִי (*Qeri*) expunged, probably because (as Böttcher,

N. Aehrenl. ii. S. 166, supposes) they considered it merely a repetition. The meaning is not thereby changed. According to the *Qeri*, we would require to translate, “against [him who] bends [the bow, may there be, or come], one who bends his bow;” according to the *Kethib*, “against [him who] bends [the bow], may he who bends his bow bend it.” As to אֲשֶׁר אָלַיְדָךְ with אָלַיְדָךְ omitted, cf. 1 Chron. xv. 12, 2 Chron. i. 4, and Ewald, § 333, b. יְתַחַל בְּם' stands in apposition to אָלַיְדָךְ; יְתַחַל is the Hithpael from הָלַח, and means to raise oneself: it is to be taken as the shortened form of the imperfect passive; cf. Gesenius, § 128, Rem. 2. Certainly, the Hithpael of הָלַע occurs nowhere else, but it is quite appropriate here; so that it is unnecessary, with Hitzig, to adduce, for explanation, the Arabic تَلْعَ, to stretch the head out of anything, or, with Ewald, to derive the form from the Aramaic לְלַע, Arabic غَلَ, to thrust in. Neither is there any foundation for the remark, that the abbreviated form of the imperfect would be admissible only if לְאָלַע were found instead of לְלַע. Indeed, the Syriac, Targum, and Vulgate have actually read and rendered from לְלַע, which several codices also present, “Let him not bend his bow, nor stretch himself in his coat of mail.” But by this reading the first half of the verse is put in contradiction to the second; and this contradiction is not removed by the supposition of J. D. Michaelis and Hitzig, who refer these clauses to the Chaldeans, and find the thought expressed in them, that the Chaldeans, through loss of courage, cannot set themselves for defence. For, in that case, we would be obliged, with Hitzig, to explain as spurious the words that follow, “and spare ye not her young men;” but for this there is no valid reason. As to תְּהִרְמִמָּה, cf. l. 21, 26. On ver. 4, cf. l. 30 and xlix. 26. The suffix in “her streets” refers to Babylon.

Vers. 5–14. Because of the righteousness of Israel, Babylon is to be irretrievably destroyed. Ver. 5. “For Israel is not forsaken, nor Judah of his God, of Jahveh of hosts; but their land is full of guilt because of the Holy One of Israel. Ver. 6. Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and save ye every one his life: do not perish for her iniquity; because it is a time of vengeance for Jahveh; He renders to her what she has committed. Ver. 7. Babylon [was] a golden cup in the hand

of Jahveh, that intoxicated all the earth. Nations have drunk of her wine, therefore nations are mad. Ver. 8. Babylon has fallen suddenly and been broken : howl over her : take balsam for her pain; perhaps she may be healed. Ver. 9. 'We have tried to heal Babylon, but she is not healed. Leave her, and let us go each one to his own land; for her judgment reaches unto heaven, and is lifted up to the clouds.' Ver. 10. Jahveh hath brought forth our righteousnesses; come, and let us declare in Zion the doing of Jahveh our God. Ver. 11. Sharpen the arrow, fill the shields: Jahveh hath roused the spirit of the kings of Media; for His counsel is against Babylon, to destroy it; because it is the vengeance of Jahveh, the vengeance of His temple. Ver. 12. Against the walls of Babylon raise a standard; strengthen the watch, set watchmen, prepare the ambushes: for Jahveh hath both devised and done what He spake against the inhabitants of Babylon. Ver. 13. O thou that dwellest upon many waters, rich in treasures, thine end hath come, the measure of thy gain. Ver. 14. Jahveh of hosts hath sworn by Himself, 'Surely I have filled thee with men, as [with] the locust; and they shall raise a shout of joy against thee.'

The offence of Babylon against the Holy One of Israel demands its destruction. In ver. 5, two reasons are given for God's determination to destroy Babylon. The Lord is induced to this (1) by His relation to Israel and Judah, whom Babylon will not let go; (2) by the grave offence of Babylon. Israel is פָּנָא נָשָׁה, "not widowed," forsaken by his God; *i.e.*, Jahveh, the God of hosts, has not rejected His people for ever, so as not to trouble Himself any more about them; cf. Isa. 1. 1, liv. 4 ff. "Their land"—the land of the Chaldeans—"is full of guilt before the Holy One of Israel," partly through their relation to Israel (l. 21), partly through their idolatry (l. 2, 38). פָּנָא does not mean here "on the side of," but "on account of," because they do not acknowledge Jahveh as the Holy One of Israel.—Ver. 6. In order to escape the punishment that is to fall on the guilt-laden city, the Israelites living in Babylon must flee to save their lives; cf. l. 8, and on the mode of expression, xlvi. 6. "Be not destroyed פָּנָא נָשָׁה, for her iniquity," (נָשָׁה of price), not "in her guilt" = punishment for sin (Graf), or "through her guilt" (Nägelsbach). Both of these last two

views are against the context; for the idea is, that Israel must flee to save his life, and that he too may not atone for the guilt of Babylon. On the expression, "it is a time of vengeance," etc., cf. l. 15, Isa. xxxiv. 8. מִשְׁלָמָה מִטְלָל, as in Isa. lix. 18, lxvi. 6. מִטְלָל, *prop.* accomplishment, actual proof, is used both of human and divine doing and working, of human misdeeds and divine recompense. מִתְהָדֵד is used emphatically.—Ver. 7 f. Babylon, certainly, in its former power and greatness, was a golden goblet, by means of which Jahveh presented to the nations the wine of His wrath, and intoxicated them; but now it is fallen, and broken without remedy. Isa. xxi. 9 finds an echo in the expression, "Babylon is fallen." The figure of the cup refers us back to xxv. 15 ff., where, however, it is applied in a different way. The cup is said to be of gold, in order to point out the splendour and glory of Nebuchadnezzar's dominion. "In the hand of Jahveh," *i.e.* used by Him as His instrument for pouring out His wrath to the nations. But Babylon has suddenly fallen and been broken in pieces. At this point Jeremiah drops the figure of the cup, for a golden cup does not break when it falls. The fall is so terrible, that the nations in Babylon are summoned to participate in the lamentation, and to lend their aid in repairing her injuries. But they answer that their attempts to heal her are fruitless. (On צְדִיקָה, cf. xlvi. 11 and viii. 22.) The terrible and irreparable character of the fall is thus expressed in a dramatic manner. We must neither think of the allies and mercenaries as those who are addressed (Schnurrer, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Hitzig), nor merely the Israelites who had been delivered from Babylon (Umbreit). The latter view is opposed by the words which follow, "Let every one go to his own country;" this points to men out of different lands. And the former assumption is opposed by the consideration that not merely the mercenaries, but also the allies are to be viewed as fallen and ruined together with Babylon, and that Babylon, which had subdued all the nations, has no allies, according to the general way in which the prophet views these things. Those addressed are rather the nations that had been vanquished by Babylon and detained in the city, of which Israel was one. Inasmuch as these were the servants of Babylon, and as such bound to pay her service,

they are to heal Babylon; and because the attempts to heal her prove fruitless, they are to leave the ruined city. They answer this summons by the resolve, "We will go every one to his own land;" cf. l. 8, 16. The motive for this resolution, "for her guilt reaches up to heaven," certainly shows that it is Israelites who are speaking, because it is only they who form their opinions in such a way; but they speak in the name of all the strangers who are in Babylon. מִשְׁפָט is the matter upon which judgment is passed, *i.e.* the transgression, the guilt, analogous to בְּמִימִם, Ezek. vii. 23, and מִשְׁפָט מִוּת, Deut. xix. 6, xxi. 22; it does not mean the punishment adjudged, of which we cannot say that it reaches up to heaven. On this expression, cf. Ps. lvii. 11, cviii. 5. Through the fall of Babylon, the Lord has made manifest the righteousness of Israel; the redeemed ones are to proclaim this in Zion. אֲרָקִים does not mean "righteous acts" (Judg. v. 11), but proofs of the righteousness of Israel as opposed to Babylon, which righteousness Babylon, through tyrannical oppression of the people that had been delivered up to it merely for chastisement, has failed to perceive, and which, so long as the Lord did not take His people to Himself again in a visible manner, was hidden from the world; cf. Ps. xxxvii. 6.—Ver. 11. The instruments which the Lord employs in bringing about the fall of Babylon are the kings of the Medes, *i.e.* the provincial governors, or heads of the separate provinces into which the Medes in ancient times were divided, until, after revolting from the Assyrians in the year 714 B.C., they put themselves under a common head, in order to assert their independence, and chose Dejokes as their monarch. See Spiegel's *Erân* (1863, S. 308 ff.), and Delitzsch on Isa. xiii. 17, who rightly remarks that in Isa. xiii. 17, as well as here, 'אָמֹר is a general designation for the Aryan tribes of Iran, taken from the most important and influential nation. In xxi. 2, Isaiah mentions Elam in the first series, along with Media, as a conqueror of Babylon; and the Babylonian kingdom was destroyed by Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian. But the Persians are first named in the Old Testament by Ezekiel and Daniel, while the name "Elam" as a province of the Persian kingdom is gradually lost, from the times of Cyrus onwards, in that of the "Persians." The princes of Media

are to prepare themselves for besieging and conquering Babylon. **הַכְּרָר** (from **כְּרַר**), prop. to polish, cleanse from dirt and rust. The arrows are thereby sharpened; cf. Isa. xlix. 2. **מַלְאָא הַשְׁלָטִים** is variously explained. The meaning of "shields" is that best established for **שְׁלָטִים** (see on 2 Sam. viii. 7); while the meaning of "armour equipment," which is defended by Thenius, is neither very suitable for 2 Sam. viii. 7 nor for 2 Kings xi. 10 and Cant. iv. 4. There is not the least foundation for the meaning "quiver," which is assumed merely for this passage. **מַלְאָא הַשְׁלָטִים** is to be explained in accordance with the analogous expression in 2 Kings ix. 24, **מַלְאָא יָדו בָּקָשָׁת**, "he filled his hand with the bow," i.e. seized the bow. "Fill the shields" with your bodies, or with your arms, since we put these among the straps of the shields. Those addressed are the kings of the Medes, whose spirit God has stirred up to make war against Babylon; for it is against her that His mind or plan is directed. As to the expression, "for it is the vengeance of Jahveh," etc., cf. l. 15, 28. The attack is to be directed against the walls of Babylon. **מַעַן**, "standard," is the military sign carried before the army, in order to show them the direction they are to take, and the point of attack. **מִשְׁמָר**, "watch," is the force besieging the city; cf. 2 Sam. xi. 16. "Make the watch strong," i.e. enclose the city firmly. This is more exactly specified in the following clauses. "Set watches," not as a guard for their own camp (Hitzig), but against the city, in order to maintain a close siege. "Place the ambushes," that they may peep into the city whenever a sally is made by the besieged; cf. Josh. viii. 14 ff., Judg. xx. 33 ff. "For what Jahveh hath determined, He will also perform." **בָּם—בָּם**, "as well as :" He has resolved as well as done, i.e. as He has resolved, He also executes.—Ver. 13. All the supports of the Babylonian power, its strong position on the Euphrates, and its treasures, which furnished the means for erecting strong fortifications, cannot avert the ruin decreed by God. As to the form **שְׁבַנְתִּי**, see on xxii. 23. It is the city with its inhabitants that is addressed, personified as a virgin or daughter. The many waters on which Babylon dwells are the Euphrates, with the canals, trenches, dykes, and marshes which surrounded Babylon, and afforded her a

strong protection against hostile attacks, but at the same time contributed to increase the wealth of the country and the capital.¹ The great riches, however, by which Babylon became רַבָּת אֲוֹצָרָה, “great in treasures,” so that Æschylus (*Pers.* 52) calls it *Baβυλῶν ἡ πολύχρυσος*, were derived from the enormous spoils which Nebuchadnezzar brought to it, partly from Nineveh, partly from Jernusalem, and from the tribute paid by Syria and the wealthy commercial cities of Phœnicia. “Thine end is come;” cf. Gen. vi. 13. עַד בָּאֵל תִּמְלָא, “the ell (i.e. the measure) of thy gain,” i.e. the limit put to thine unjust gain. The words are connected with “thine end is come” by zeugma. This explanation is simpler than the interpretation adopted by Venema, Eichhorn, and Maurer, from the Vulgate *pedalis præcisionis tuæ*, viz. “the ell of cutting thee off.” Böttcher (*Proben*, S. 289, note *m*) seeks to vindicate the rendering in the following paraphrase: “The ell at which thou shalt be cut off, like something woven or spun, when it has reached the destined number of ells.” According to this view, “ell” would stand for the complete number of the ells determined on; but there is no consideration of the question whether עַד, “to cut off the thread of life,” Isa. xxxviii. 12, can be applied to a city. —Ver. 14. The Lord announces destruction to Babylon with a solemn oath. Many take מִנְיָם in the sense of מִלְּאָה in oaths: “truly, certainly.” But this use of the expression is neither fully established, nor suitable in this connection. In 2 Sam. xv. 21 (the only passage that can be cited in its behalf), the meaning “only” gives good enough sense. Ewald (§ 356, *b*) wrongly adduces 2 Kings v. 20 in support of the above meaning, and three lines below he attributes the signi-

¹ Duncker, *Gesch. d. Alterth.* i. S. 846, remarks: “The fertility of the soil of Babylon—the produce of the fields—depended on the inundations of the Euphrates. By means of an extensive system of dykes, canals, and river-walls, Nebuchadnezzar succeeded not only in conducting the water of the Euphrates to every point in the plain of Babylon, but also in averting the formation of marshes and the occurrence of floods (which were not rare), as well as regulating the inundation.” The purpose for which these water-works were constructed, was “first of all, irrigation and navigation; but they at the same time afforded strong lines of defence against the foe” (Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assyr. u. Bab.* S. 219). See details regarding these magnificent works in Duncker, S. 845 ff.; Niebuhr, S. 218 ff.

fication "although" to the passage now before us. Moreover, the asseveration, "Verily I have filled thee with men as with locusts, and they shall sing the Hedad over thee," can have a suitable meaning only if we take "I have filled thee" prophetically, and understand the filling with men as referring to the enemy, when the city has been reduced (Hitzig). But to fill a city with men hardly means quite the same as to put a host of enemies in it. 'א serves merely to introduce the oath, and וְ means "although,"—as, for instance, in Job ix. 15. The meaning is not, "When I filled thee with men, as with locusts, the only result was, that a more abundant wine-pressing could be obtained" (Nägelsbach), for this thought is foreign to the context; the meaning rather is, "Even the countless multitudes of men in Babylon will not avail it" (Ewald), will not keep it from ruin. יְמִינָה, the song sung at the pressing of wine, is, from the nature of the case, the battle-song; see on xxv. 30.

Vers. 15–26. The omnipotence of the Lord and Creator of the whole world will destroy the idols of Babylon, and break the mighty kingdom that rules the world. Ver. 15. "He who made the earth by His strength, establishing the world by His wisdom, and stretched out the heavens by His understanding; Ver. 16. When, thundering, He makes a roaring sound of water in the heavens, He causes clouds to ascend from the end of the earth, makes lightnings for the rain, and brings forth the wind out of His treasures. Ver. 17. Every man without knowledge is brutish; every goldsmith is ashamed because of the image: for his molten work is a lie, and there is no spirit in them. Ver. 18. They are vanity, a work of mockery; in their time of visitation they perish. Ver. 19. The Portion of Jacob is not like these; for He is the framer of all, and of the tribe of his inheritance: Jahveh of hosts is His name. Ver. 20. Thou art a hammer to me, weapons of war; and with thee I will break nations in pieces, and with thee destroy kingdoms. Ver. 21. And with thee I will break in pieces the horse and his rider, and with thee I will break in pieces the chariot and its rider. Ver. 22. And with thee I will break in pieces man and woman, and with thee I will break in pieces old and young, and with thee I will break in pieces young man and maiden. Ver. 23. And with thee I will break in pieces the shepherd and

his flock, and with thee I will break in pieces the husbandman and his yoke [of oxen], and with thee I will break in pieces governors and deputy-governors. Ver. 24. And I will recompense to Babylon, and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea, all their evil which they have done in Zion before your eyes, saith Jahveh. Ver. 25. Behold, I am against thee, O mountain of destruction, saith Jahveh, that destroyed all the earth; and I will stretch out my hand against thee, and roll thee down from the rocks, and make thee a burnt mountain, Ver. 26. So that they shall not take from thee a stone for a corner, or a stone for foundations; but thou shalt be desolations for ever, saith Jahveh."

In order to establish, against all doubt, the fall of Babylon that has been announced under solemn oath, Jeremiah, in vers. 15-19, repeats a passage from the address in x. 12-16, in which he holds up before the people, by way of warning, the almighty power of the living God, and the destruction of the idols at the time of the judgment. In chap. x. he wished, by means of this announcement, to combat the fears of the idolatrous people for the power of the heathen gods; here he seeks by the same means to destroy the confidence of the Chaldeans in their gods, and to state that all idols will be destroyed before the almighty power of the Creator and Ruler of the whole world on the day of judgment, and Israel shall then learn that He who formed the universe will show Himself, by the fall of Babylon, as the Creator of Israel. The whole passage is repeated *verbatim*, on till a change made in ver. 19, where יִשְׂרָאֵל is omitted before שָׁבֵט שָׁבֵט, and these words are connected with what precedes: "He is the former of all, and of the tribe which belongs to Him as His own property," *i.e.* Israel. This alteration is not to be put to the account of a copyist, who omitted the word "Israel" through an oversight, but is due to Jeremiah: there was no need here, as in chap. x., for bringing into special prominence the relation of Israel to his God.¹ As to the rest, see

¹ In chap. x. 16 the LXX. have taken no account either of שָׁבֵט or יִשְׂרָאֵל. Hence Movers, Hitzig, and Ewald infer that these words have found their way into the text as a gloss suggested by Deut. xxxii. 9, and should be deleted. But in this they are wrong. The omission of the two words by the LXX. is a result of the erroneous translation there given of the first clause

the exposition of x. 12-16. In vers. 20-26 the destruction of Babylon and its power is further carried out in two figures. In vers. 20-24 Babylon is compared to a hammer, which God uses for the purpose of beating to pieces nations and kingdoms, with their forces and their inhabitants, but on which He will afterwards requite the evil done to Zion. מְפִיץ is equivalent to מְפִיץ, Prov. xxv. 18, one who breaks in pieces; hence a battle-hammer. Hitzig takes בְּלִי to be a singular, "formed thus in order to avoid an accumulation of *i* sounds (cf. פְּלִיטִים with פְּלִיטִי)." This is possible, but neither necessary nor probable. The plural, "weapons of war," is added, because the battle-hammer is considered as including all weapons of war. By the hammer, Ewald understands "the true Israel;" Hitzig, Cyrus, the destroyer of Babylon; Nägelsbach, an ideal person. These three views are based on the fact that the operation performed by means of the hammer (breaking to pieces) is marked by perfects with *i* relative (וְנִפְצַת), which is also true of the retribution to be made on Babylon: from this it is inferred that the breaking with the hammer, as well as the retribution, is still future, and that the meaning is, "When I hammer in this way with thee, I will requite Babylon" (Hitzig); while Ewald concludes from nothing but the context that the words refer to Israel. But none of these reasons is decisive, nor any of the three views tenable. The context gives decided support to the opinion that in ver. 20 ff. it is Babylon that is addressed, just as in ver. 13 f. and ver. 25; a further proof is, that as early as chap. l. 23, Babylon is called "the hammer of the whole earth." Only very weighty reasons, then, could induce us to refer the same figure, as used here, to another nation. The word פְּטִישׁ (l. 23), "hammer, smith's hammer" (Isa. xli. 7), is not essentially different from מְפִיץ, which is used here of the verse. This the LXX. have rendered οὐ τοιαύτη μερὶς τῷ Ἰακώβ, instead of οὐ τοιαύτη ἡ μερὶς τοῦ Ἰακώβ. Having done so, it was impossible for them to continue, ἔτι ὁ πλάσσεις τὰ πάντα αὐτός, because they could not predicate this of μερὶς, which they evidently did not take to mean God. And if they were to connect οὐ with what followed, they were bound to omit the two words, for it would never have done to take together οὐκαναντίον Ιουραλְשָׁבֶט נְקָלָה. They therefore simply omitted the troublesome words, and went on to translate: ἔτι ὁ πλάσσεις τὰ πάντα αὐτὸς κληρονομία αὐτοῦ. Cf. Nägelsbach, *Jeremia u. Babylon*, S. 94.

The figure is quite inapplicable to Israel, because “ Israel is certainly to be delivered through the destruction of Babylon, but is not to be himself the instrument of the destruction ” (Graf). Finally, the employment of the perfect with a relative, both in connection with the shattering to pieces which God accomplishes with (by means of) Babylon, and also the retribution He will execute on Babylon, is explained by the fact, that just as, in prophetic vision, what Babylon does to the nations, and what happens to it, was not separated into two acts, distinct from one another, but appeared as one continuous whole, so also the work of Babylon as the instrument of destruction was not yet finished, but had only begun, and still continuing, was partly future, like the retribution which it was to receive for its offence against Zion ; just as in ver. 13 Babylon is viewed as then still in the active exercise of its power ; and the purpose for which God employs it, as well as the fate that is to befall it, is presented together in something like this manner : “ O Babylon, who art my hammer with which I break peoples and kingdoms in pieces, thee will I requite ! ” There is separate mention made of the instances of breaking, in a long enumeration, which becomes tedious through the constant repetition of the verb—something like the enumeration in chap. 1. 35-38, where, however, the constant repetition of **חֶרְבָּה** gives great emphasis to the address. First comes the general designation, nations and kingdoms ; then military forces ; then (ver. 25) the inhabitants of the kingdoms, arranged, as in Ezek. xxiii. 6, 23, according to sex, age, and class, labouring classes (shepherds, and husbandmen with their cattle) ; and lastly dignitaries, satraps and lieutenant-governors, **פָּחוֹת וּסְגָנִים**, as in Ezek. xxiii. 6, 23. **פָּחהּ** probably comes from the Zendic *pavan* (root *pa*), of which a dialectic form is *pagvan*, “ upholder of government ; ” see on Hag. i. 1. **נָשָׁר** corresponds to the *ξωγάνης* of the Athenians, “ lieutenant-governor ; ” but it is not much that has hitherto been ascertained with regard to this office ; see Delitzsch on Isa. xli. 25 [Clark’s translation]. On **שְׁלֹמְמִיחִי וּנוֹ'**, cf. ver. 6 and l. 15, 29 ; “ before your eyes, ” towards the end of this verse, belongs to this verb in the main clause. This retribution is set forth in ver. 25 f. under a new figure. Babylon is called the “ mountain of destruction ; ” this name is imme-

diately explained by the predicate, “ that destroys the whole earth,” brings destruction on it. The name **הַר הַפְּשִׁחַת** is applied in 2 Kings xxiii. 13 to the Mount of Olives, or its southern summit, the so-called *mons offensionis vel scandali* of ecclesiastical tradition, on which Solomon had erected idolatrous altars for his foreign wives ; the name refers to the pernicious influence thereby exercised on the religious life of Israel. In this verse, “ destruction ” is used in a comprehensive sense of the physical and moral ruin which Babylon brought on the nations. Babylon is a “ mountain,” as being a powerful kingdom, supereminent above others ; whether there is also a reference in the title to its lofty buildings (C. B. Michaelis) seems doubtful. “ I will roll thee down from the rocks,” *de petris, in quarum fastigiis hucusque eminuisti. Non efferes te amplius super alia regna* (C. B. Mich.). To this Hitzig adds, by way of explanation : “ The summit of the mountain is sometimes changed into the very position occupied by the crater.” From what follows, “ I will make thee a mountain of burning,” *i.e.* either a burning, or bnrnt, burnt-out mountain, modern expositors infer, with J. D. Michaelis, that the prophet has before his mind a volcano in active eruption, “ for no other kind of mountains could devastate countries ; it is just volcanoes which have been hollowed out by fire that fall in, or, it may be, tumble down into the valley below, scattering their constituent elements here and there ; the stones of such mountains, too, are commonly so much broken and burnt, that they are of no use for building” (Hitzig). Of the above remarks this much is correct, that the words, “ I will make thee a burning mountain,” are founded on the conception of a volcano ; any more extended application, however, of the figure to the whole verse is unwarranted. The clause, “ I will roll thee down from the rocks,” cannot possibly be applied to the action of a volcano in eruption (though Nägelsbach does so apply it), unless we are ready to impute to the prophet a false notion regarding the eruptions of volcanoes. By the eruption, a mountain is not loosened from the rock on which it rests, and hurled down into the valleys round about ; it is only the heart of the mountain, or the rocks on which its summit rests, that seem to be vomited out of it. Besides, the notion that there is a representation of

an active volcano in the first clauses of the verse, is disproved by the very fact that the mountain, Babylon, does not bring ruin on the earth, as one that is burning; it is not to become such until after it has been rolled down from the rocks on which it rests. The laying waste of the countries is not ascribed to the fire that issues from the mountain, but the mountain begins to burn only after it has been rolled down from its rocks. Babylon, as a kingdom and city, is called a mountain, because it mightily surpassed and held sway over them; cf. Isa. ii. 14. It brings ruin on the whole earth by subjugation of the nations and devastation of the countries. The mountain rests on rocks, *i.e.* its power has a foundation as firm as a rock, until the Lord rolls it down from its height, and burns the strong mountain, making it like an extinct volcano, the stones of which, having been rendered vitreous by the fire, no longer furnish material that can be employed for the foundation of new buildings. "A corner-stone," etc., is explained by C. B. Michaelis, after the Chaldee, Kimchi, and others, to mean, "no one will appoint a king or a prince any more out of the stock of the Chaldeans." This is against the context, according to which the point treated of is, not the fall of the kingdom in or of Babylon, but the destruction of Babylon as a city and kingdom. Hitzig and Graf, accordingly, take the meaning to be this: Not a stone of the city will be used for a new building,—no one will any more build for himself among their ruins, and out of the material there. The corner-stone and the foundation (it is further asserted) are mentioned by way of example, not because particularly large and good stones are needed for these parts, but because every house begins with them. But though the following clause, "thou shalt be an everlasting desolation," contains this idea, yet this interpretation neither exhausts nor gives a generally correct view of the meaning of the words, "no one will take from thee a corner-stone or a foundation-stone." The burning of the mountain signifies not merely that Babylon was to be burned to ashes, but that her sway over the world was to be quite at an end; this was only to come about when the city was burnt. When no stone of any value for a new building is to be left after this conflagration, this is equivalent to saying that nothing will be left of the empire that has been destroyed,

which would be of any use in the foundation of another state. The last clause also (" for thou shalt be," etc.) refers to more than the destruction of the city of Babylon. This is seen even in the fundamental passage, xxv. 12, where the same threat is uttered against the land of the Chaldeans.

Vers. 27-37. A summons addressed to the nations to fight against Babylon, in order that, by reducing the city, vengeance may be taken for the offence committed against Israel by Babylon. Ver. 27. " Lift up a standard on the earth, sound a trumpet among the nations, prepare the nations against her, call the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni, and Ashkenaz against her; appoint troops against her; bring up horses like horrid locusts. Ver. 28. Prepare nations against her, the kings of the Medes and her governors, and all her lieutenant-governors, and all the land of his dominion. Ver. 29. Then the earth quakes and trembles: for the purposes of Jahveh against Babylon are being performed, to make the land of Babylon a desolation, without an inhabitant. Ver. 30. The heroes of Babylon have ceased to fight, they sit in the strongholds: their strength is dried up; they have become women; they have set her habitations on fire; her bars are broken. Ver. 31. One runner runs against another, and one messenger against another, to tell the king of Babylon that his city is wholly taken. Ver. 32. And the crossing-places have been seized, and the marshes have they burned up with fire, and the men of war are confounded. Ver. 33. For thus saith Jahveh of hosts, the God of Israel: The daughter of Babylon is like a threshing-floor at the time when it is trodden; yet a little, and the time of harvest will come to her. Ver. 34. Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured us, and ground us down; he hath set us down [like] an empty vessel, he hath swallowed us like a dragon, he hath filled his belly with my dainties; he hath thrust me out. Ver. 35. Let the inhabitress of Zion say, ' My wrong and my flesh [be] upon Babylon; ' and let Jerusalem say, ' My blood be upon the inhabitants of Chaldea.' Ver. 36. Therefore thus saith Jahveh: Behold, I will plead thy cause, and execute vengeance for thee; and I will dry up her sea, and make her fountain dry. Ver. 37. And Babylon shall become heaps [of ruins], a dwelling-place

of dragons, an astonishment, and a hissing, without an inhabitant."

The lifting up of the standard (ver. 27) serves as a signal for the nations to assemble for the struggle against Babylon. בָּרֶץ does not mean "in the land," but, as the parallel "among the nations" shows, "on the earth." קְרַב, "consecrate [prepare] against her (Babylon) nations" for the war; cf. vi. 4, xxii. 7. קְשַׁמְעֵץ, as in l. 29. The kingdoms summoned are: *Ararat*, i.e. the middle (or eastern) province of Armenia, in the plain of Araxes, which Moses of Choren calls *Arairad*, *Araratia* (see on Gen. viii. 4); *Minni*, which, according to the Syriac and Chaldee, is also a name of Armenia, probably its western province (see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, p. 807); and *Ashkenaz*, which the Jews take to be Germany, although only this much is certain, that it is a province in the neighbourhood of Armenia. For *Asken* is an Armenian proper name, and *az* an Armenian termination; cf. Lagarde's *Gesammelte Abhandl.* S. 254, and Delitzsch on Gen. x. 3, 4th ed. בְּקָרֶת, "appoint, order against her." טְפָכָר does not mean "captains" or leaders, for this meaning of the foreign word (supposed to be Assyrian) rests on a very uncertain etymology; it means some peculiar kind of troops, but nothing more definite can be affirmed regarding it. This meaning is required by the context both here and in Nah. iii. 17, the only other place where the word occurs: see on that passage. The sing. טְפָכָר corresponds with the sing. סָמֵךְ, and is therefore to be taken collectively, "troops and horses." Whether the simile פִּילְקָסָמֵר belongs merely to "horses," or to the combination "troops and horses," depends on the meaning attached to the expression. Modern expositors render it "bristly locusts;" and by that they understand, like Credner (*Joel*, S. 298), the young grasshopper after it has laid aside its third skin, when the wings are still enveloped in rough horny sheaths, and stick straight up from the back of the animal. But this explanation rests on an erroneous interpretation of Nah. iii. 17. סָמֵר means to shudder, and is used of the shivering or quivering of the body (Ps. cxix. 120), and of the hair (Job iv. 15); and פִּילְקָס does not mean a particular kind of locusts, though Jerome, on Nah. iii. 17, renders it *attelabus* (*parva locusta est inter locustam et bruchum, et modicis pennis*).

reptans potius quam volans, semperque subsiliens), but is a poetic epithet of the locust, “the devourer.” If any one prefers to view סָפָר as referring to the nature of the locusts, he may, with Bochart and Rosenmüller, think of the *locustarum species, quæ habet caput hirsutum*. But the epithet “horrid” is probably intended merely to point out the locusts as a fearful scourge of the country. On this view, the comparison refers to both clauses, and is meant to set forth not merely the enormous multitude of the soldiery, but also the devastation they make of the country. In ver. 28 mention is further made of the kings of the Medes (see on ver. 11), together with their governors and lieutenant-governors (see on ver. 23), and, in order to give prominence to the immense strength of the army, of “all the land of his dominion;” on these expressions, cf. xxxiv. 1 and 1 Kings ix. 19. The suffix refers to the king of Media, as the leader of the whole army; while those in “her governors, and all her lieutenant-governors,” refer to the country of Media.— Ver. 29 f. On the advance of this mighty host against Babylon, to execute the judgment determined by the Lord, the earth quakes. The mighty men of Babylon cease to offer resistance, and withdraw dispirited, like women, into inaccessible places, while the enemy sets fire to the houses, breaks the bars, and captures the city. The prophet views all this in spirit as already present, and depicts in lively colours the attack on the city and its capture. Hence the historic tenses, שָׁׁמַרְעָשׁ, וְתַחַלְ, חַרְלָא, etc. הנְּקָדָה is used of the permanence, *i.e.* of the realization of the divine counsels, as in xliv. 23 f. On the singular, see Ewald, § 317, a. “To make the land,” etc., as in iv. 7, xviii. 16, etc. “They sit (have taken up their position) in the strongholds” (mountain fastnesses), *i.e.* in inaccessible places; cf. 1 Sam. xiii. 16, 2 Sam. xxiii. 14. נְשָׁתָה is but to be regarded as a Kal form from נְשַׁתָּה; on its derivation from נְשָׁתָה, see on Isa. xli. 17. “They have become women;” cf. l. 37. The subject of the verb הַצִּיתָה is the enemy, who set fire to the dwellings in Babylon. “Runner runs against runner,” *i.e.* from opposite sides of the city there come messengers, who meet each other running to tell the king in his castle that the city is taken. The king is therefore (as Graf correctly remarks against Hitzig) not to be thought of as living outside of the city, for

“in this case קְרָאתְךָ would have no meaning,” but as living in the royal castle, which was situated in the middle of the city, on the Euphrates. Inasmuch as the city is taken “from the end” (מִקְצָה), i.e. on all sides, the messengers who bring the news to the king’s fortress must meet each other.—Ver. 32 permits of being taken as a continuation of the message brought to the king. מַעֲבָרוֹת, “crossing-places,” do not here mean “fords” (Judg. iii. 28); for such shallow places, where one could go through the river, are not to be found in the Euphrates at Babylon: they mean bridges and ferries, because, in addition to the stone bridge built by Nebuchadnezzar (Herodotus, i. 186; see Duncker’s *Geschichte*, i. S. 859), there must also have been at Babylon, throughout its large extent, other means of crossing, either by bridges of boats or ferries. נַחַטְשָׁי, “they have been taken,” seized by the enemy; cf. xlviii. 41. אַנְטִים are ponds and artificial lakes which had been formed for the protection of the city, of the waters of the Euphrates (Herodotus, i. 185; Arrian, vii. 17); these “they have burned with fire.” Inasmuch as a burning of ponds is an impossibility, many, with Kimchi, would understand אַנְטִים of the reeds of the marshes. But the word has no such meaning; moreover, even if it had, the burning of the reeds would have no significance for the taking of the city. Others think of the sluices and the enclosures of the artificial waters, which enclosures were constructed of wood-work; but apart from the basin of water at Sepharvaim, which could be opened by sluices, the enclosure of the ponds with wood-work is a matter of much doubt, and a burning of the wood-work is not a burning of the ponds. The expression, as Calvin long ago remarked, is hyperbolic, and not to be pressed: *Propheta hyperbolice ostendit, siccata fuisse vada Euphratis ac si quis lignum exureret igni supposito; hoc quidem aquis non convenit, sed hyperbolice melius exprimit miraculum.* On the whole, the picture is not to be taken as a description of the historical circumstances connected with the taking of Babylon by Cyrus; neither, therefore, is the burning of the ponds to be referred to the fact that the bed of the Euphrates was made dry through diversion of the stream (Herodotus, i. 191); but we have here a poetic colouring given to the thought that all Babylon’s means of offence and defence

will fall into the power of the enemy and be destroyed by them. For (according to the reason assigned in ver. 33 for what has been described) the Almighty God of Israel has decreed the destruction of Babylon. “The daughter of Babylon (*i.e.* not merely the city, but the kingdom of Babylon) is like a threshing-floor at the time when they tread it,” *i.e.* stamp on it, make the ground into a threshing-floor by treading it hard.¹ **הַדְּרִיכָה** might be the infinitive (Ewald, § 238, *d*) : it is simpler, however, to take it as a perfect, and supply the relative **אֲשֶׁר**. The meaning is, that Babylon is ripe for judgment. **עַזְּרָעַט**, “yet a little while” (*i.e.* soon), comes the time of harvest, so that the grain will be threshed, *i.e.* the judgment will be executed. The figure reminds us of Isa. xxi. 10, cf. Joel iv. 13, Mic. iv. 15, etc.—Ver. 34 f. This judgment comes on Babylon for its offences against Israel. The king of Babylon has devoured Israel, etc. Those who complain, in ver. 34, are the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem, in whose name the prophet enumerates the crimes of Babylon. “Nebuchadnezzar has devoured us,” *i.e.* oppressed us. The plural suffixes to the verbs have been needlessly changed in the *Qeri* into singulars, for the simple reason, perhaps, that with **מִעְרָנִי** and in ver. 35 the address makes a transition into the singular. **הַמְּמַתֵּן** signifies to throw enemies into confusion by causing a panic, for the purpose of destroying them; hence to destroy, see on Deut. ii. 15; here to destroy, crush. “He set us down like an empty vessel” refers to the country and the people; he has swept the country of human beings, and robbed the people of everything. **תְּנִינָה**, usually a sea-monster, crocodile (Isa. xxvii. 1, li. 9, etc.); here a beast of prey which devours everything. **מִעְרָנִים**, “delights,” then “dainty meats,” Gen. xlvi. 20.² **פָּאַת**, from **פָּאַת**, signifies to wash away, push away (see Delitzsch on Isa. iv. 4); in other

¹ “The threshing-floor is an open spot in the field, carefully levelled and cleared from stones, etc., that the grain may be spread out on it for threshing.”—Paulsen, *Ackerbau der Morgenl.* S. 123. “A level spot is selected for the threshing-floors, which are then constructed near each other, of a circular form, perhaps fifty feet in diameter, merely by beating the earth hard.”—Robinson’s *Pal.* ii. 227.

² The form actually found in the Masoretic text is, **מִעְרָנִי**, “from (out of, with) my dainties.”—TR.

places Jeremiah uses בְּשָׁרֶשׁ, viii. 3, xvi. 15, etc. “Let my wrong (*i.e.* the wrong done me) come upon Babylon.” This wrong is more fully specified, with reference to the figure of swallowing, by “my flesh and blood;” cf. Mic. iii. 3. The Lord will avenge this wrong, ver. 36, cf. l. 34, li. 6, 11; He will also dry up the sea of Babylon, and make her spring dry up. Many expositors understand these latter words metaphorically, as referring to the sea of nations surging in Babylon (vers. 42, 55), and view the treasures and riches as the fountain from which the sea of nations sprang up (Hitzig); but the context demands a literal interpretation, inasmuch as in ver. 37 the subject treated of is the laying waste of the country. The sea of Babylon is the Euphrates, with its canals, lakes, and marshes, *i.e.* the abundance of water to which Babylonia owed its fertility, and the city its influence as the centre of the then known world. Isaiah (xxi. 1) accordingly calls Babylon, emblematically, the desert of the sea, inasmuch as the region in which Babylon stands is a plain, broken in such a manner by the Euphrates, as well as by marshes and lakes, as that the city, so to speak, swims in the sea (Delitzsch). The source or spring of the sea is the Euphrates, and the drying up of this spring is not to be understood literally of the drying up of the Euphrates, but signifies a drying up of the springs of water that fertilize the country. On the figures employed in ver. 37, cf. ix. 10, xviii. 16, xl. 33.

Vers. 38-49. The inhabitants of Babylon fall; the city perishes with its idols, to the joy of the whole world.—Ver. 38. “Together they roar like young lions, they growl like the whelps of lionesses. Ver. 39. When they are heated, I will prepare their banquets, and will make them drunk, that they may exult and sleep an eternal sleep, and not awake, saith Jahveh. Ver. 40. I will bring them down like lambs to be slaughtered, like rams with he-goats. Ver. 41. How is Sheshach taken, and the praise of the whole earth seized! How Babylon is become an astonishment among the nations! Ver. 42. The sea has gone up over Babylon: she is covered with the multitude of its waves. Ver. 43. Her cities have become a desolation, a land of drought, and a steppe, a land wherein no man dwells, and through which no son of man passes. Ver. 44. And I will

punish Bel in Babylon, and will bring out of his mouth what he has swallowed, and no longer shall nations go in streams to him: the wall of Babylon also shall fall. Ver. 45. Go ye out from the midst of her, my people! and save ye each one his life from the burning of the wrath of Jahveh. Ver. 46. And lest your heart be weak, and ye be afraid because of the report which is heard in the land, and there comes the [=this] report in the [=this] year, and afterwards in the [=that] year the [=that] report, and violence in the land, ruler against ruler. Ver. 47. Therefore, behold, days are coming when I will punish the graven images of Babylon; and her whole land shall dry up,¹ and all her slain ones shall fall in her midst. Ver. 48. And heaven and earth, and all that is in them, shall sing for joy over Babylon: for the destroyers shall come to her from the north, saith Jahveh. Ver. 49. As Babylon sought that slain ones of Israel should fall, so there fall, in behalf of Babylon, slain ones of the whole earth."

This avenging judgment shall come on the inhabitants of Babylon in the midst of their revelry. Ver. 38. They roar and growl like young lions over their prey; cf. ii. 15, Amos iii. 4. When, in their revelries, they will be heated over their prey, the Lord will prepare for them a banquet by which they shall become intoxicated, so that they sink down, exulting (*i.e.* staggering while they shout), into an eternal sleep of death. θερμή, "their heat," or heating, is the glow felt in gluttony and revelry, cf. Hos. vii. 4 f., not specially the result or effect of a drinking-bout; and the idea is not that, when they become heated through a banquet, then the Lord will prepare another one for them, but merely this, that in the midst of their revelry the Lord will prepare for them the meal they deserve, viz. give them the cup of wrath to drink, so that they may fall down intoxicated into eternal sleep, from which they no more awake. These words are certainly not a special prediction of the fact mentioned by Herodotus (i. 191) and Xenophon (*Cyrop.* vii. 23), that Cyrus took Babylon while the Babylonians were celebrating a feast and holding a banquet; they are merely a figurative dress given to the thought that the inhabitants of Babylon will be surprised by the judgment of death

¹ Rather, "shall be ashamed;" see note at foot of p. 311.—Tr.

in the midst of their riotous enjoyment of the riches and treasures taken as spoil from the nations. In that fact, however, this utterance has received a fulfilment which manifestly confirms the infallibility of the word of God. In ver. 40, what has been said is confirmed by another figure; cf. xlvi. 5 and l. 27. Lambs, rams, goats, are emblems of all the classes of the people of Israel; cf. Isa. xxxiv. 6, Ezek. xxxix. 18.—Ver. 41 ff. The fearful destruction of Babylon will astonish the world.—Ver. 41 is an exclamation of astonishment regarding the conquest of the city which was praised throughout the world. As to פָּשָׁע, see on ver. 1 and xxv. 26. פָּהָר, “praise,” is here used for “a subject of praise and fame;” cf. xl ix. 25.—Ver. 42 f. Description of the fall. The sea that has come over Babylon and covered it with its waves, was taken figuratively, even by the Chaldee paraphrasts, and understood as meaning the hostile army that overwhelms the land with its hosts. Only J. D. Michaelis was inclined to take the words in their proper meaning, and understood them as referring to the inundation of Babylon by the Euphrates in Angust and in winter. But however true it may be, that, in consequence of the destruction or decay of the great river-walls built by Nebuchadnezzar, the Euphrates may inundate the city of Babylon when it swells into a flood, yet the literal acceptation of the words is unwarranted, for the simple reason that they do not speak of any momentary or temporary inundation, and that, because Babylon is to be covered with water, the cities of Babylonia are to become an arid steppe. The sea is therefore the sea of nations, cf. xlvi. 7; the description reminds us of the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea. On ver. 43, cf. xlvi. 9, xl ix. 18, 33 f., l. 12. The suffix in תְּבַדֵּל refers to “her cities;” but the repetition of תְּבַדֵּל is not for that reason wrong, as Graf thinks, but is to be explained on the ground that the cities of Babylonia are compared to a barren land; and the idea is properly this: The cities become an arid country of steppes, a land in whose cities nobody can dwell.—Ver. 44. With the conquest of Babylon, Bel, the chief deity of the Babylonians (see on l. 2), is punished; and not only is his prey torn from him, but his fame also, which attracted the nations, is destroyed. Under the prey which Bel has swallowed, and

which is to be torn out of his mouth, we must include not merely the sacred vessels which had been deposited in the temple of Belus (Dan. i. 3), and the voluntary offerings presented him (Hitzig), but all the property which Babylon had taken as spoil from the nations; and the nations themselves, with life and property, Babylon has swallowed (see 34 and l. 17). All this is now to be torn out of his jaws. Bel falls with the fall of Babylon (cf. Isa. xlvi. 1), so that nations no longer come in streams to him, to dedicate their goods and treasures to him. The description ends with the sentence, “the wall of Babylon also is fallen,” which Hitzig and Graf wrongly suspect, on the ground that it is insipid. Ewald, on the contrary, perceives in the very same expression a brief and emphatic conclusion; because the famous wall of Babylon, strong in every part, was the main defence of this great city of the world. For explaining this sentence, therefore, it is unnecessary to assume that the walls of Babylon seem to have been regarded as sacred to Bel, as Nägelsbach is inclined to infer from the names which are said to be given to these walls in an inscription translated by Oppert.¹—Ver. 45 f. Since Babylon will be punished by the Lord with destruction, the people of God are to flee out of it, and to preserve their lives from the fierce anger of Jalveh, which will discharge itself on Babylon. נִרְאָה, as in iv. 8, 26, etc.—Ver. 46. Yet they are not to despair when the catastrophe draws near, and all kinds of rumours of war and oppression are abroad. The repetition of השׁמִיעָה expresses the correlative relation,—this and that report; cf. Ewald, § 360, c. The suffix in אַחֲרֵי has a neuter sense; the word means “afterwards” (= אַחֲרֵי זֶה, Job xl. 16). וְחַקִּים בְּאַרְצֵן is also to be taken as dependent, grammatically, on יְבָא: “and when a deed of violence is committed in the land, one ruler (rises up) against the other.” These words

¹ Cf. J. Oppert, *Expédition en Mésopot.* i. p. 227, where, on the strength of an inscription of Assarhaddon, which is read, “*Imgur-Bel is its (Babylon's) chief wall, Ninivitti-Bel its rampart*,” the expressions found in the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar before the mention of the walls—viz. “*Imgur-Bel*” (may Bel - Dagon protect him) and “*Ninivitti-Bel*” (the abode of Bel)—have been explained by Rawlinson and Oppert as names of the first and second lines of fortification round Babylon.

presuppose not merely a pretty long duration of the war, but also rebellion and revolution, through which Babylon is to go to ruin. In this sense they are employed by Christ for describing the wars and risings that are to precede His advent; Matt. xxiv. 6, Mark xiii. 7, Luke xxi. 9.—Ver. 47. Therefore, viz. because what has been stated above will happen, or because the events mentioned in ver. 46 are harbingers of the judgment on Babylon,—therefore days are coming when God shall execute judgment on the idols of Babylon, and dry up the land¹ (cf. ver. 43), and all her slain ones, *i.e.* all her inhabitants shall fall down, slain in the midst of her. **לֹכֶן הַנָּה יְמִים בָּאִים**, “Therefore, behold, days are coming,” is a formula very frequently found in Jeremiah; cf. vii. 32, xvi. 14, xix. 6, xxiii. 7, etc.—Ver. 48. Heaven and earth, with all that is in them (*i.e.* the whole world, with its animate and inanimate creatures), break out into rejoicing over the fall of Babylon (cf. Isa. xliv. 23), for Babylon has enslaved and laid waste all the world. The second part of ver. 48, “for the destroyers shall come from the north,” is logically connected with ver. 47, to which ver. 48a is to be taken as subordinate, in the sense, “over which heaven and earth rejoice.” On ver. 48b, cf. l. 3, 9, 41. Both parts of ver. 49 are placed in mutual relation by **וְ**—**וְ**. These two particles, thus used, signify “as well as,” “not only . . . but also,” or “as . . . so.” Ewald, Hitzig, and Graf have quite missed the meaning of both clauses, since they take **חַלְלֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** as a vocative, and render the whole thus: “Not only must Babylon fall, O ye slain ones of Israel, but slain ones of the whole earth have fallen on the side of Babylon (or through Babylon).” This view of the expression “slain ones of Israel” cannot be established, either from grammatical considerations or from a regard to the meaning of the whole. Not only is there no occasion for a direct address to the slain ones of Israel; but by such a view of the expression, the antithesis indicated by **וְ**—**וְ**, between “the slain ones of Israel” and “the slain ones of the earth,” is thereby destroyed. Viewed grammati-

¹ Keil has here misread the Hebrew text, which runs **בָּאִים תִּבּוֹשׁ אֶרְצָת**. The verb does not come from **יִבּוֹשׁ**, *to become dry*, but from **בּוֹשׁ**, *to be ashamed*; hence the correct rendering is, “all her land shall be ashamed,” not “shall be dried up.”—Tr.

cally, “the slain ones of Israel” can only be the subject dependent on the inf. לִנְפֵל: “the fall of the slain ones of Israel.” Kimchi has long ago hit the meaning in the explanation, בְּמִן בְּבָבֶל הַיְהָה סְפִת לִנְפֵל, “as Babylon was the cause of the slain ones of Israel falling.” Similarly Jerome: *et quomodo fecit Babylon ut caderent occisi ex Israel.* This paraphrase may be vindicated on grammatical grounds, for the inf. constr. with לִ, with or without הַ, is used to express that on which one is engaged, or what one is on the point of doing; cf. Gesenius, § 132, 3, Rem. 1. In this meaning, לִנְפֵל stands here without הַ: “as Babylon was concerned in making the slain ones of Israel fall;” or better: “Just as Babylon was intent on the fall of slain ones in Israel, so also there fall because of Babylon (prop. dative, for Babylon) slain ones of all the earth;” because there are to be found, in the capital of the empire, people from all quarters of the world, who are slain when Babylon is conquered. The perf. נִנְפַּל is prophetic, like נִקְרַפֵּה in ver. 47.

Vers. 50–58. Final summing up of the offence and the punishment of Babylon. Ver. 50. “Ye who have escaped the sword, depart, do not stay! remember Jahveh from afar, and let Jerusalem come into your mind. Ver. 51. We were ashamed, because we heard reproach; shame hath covered our face, for strangers have come into the holy places of the house of Jahveh. Ver. 52. Therefore, behold, days are coming, saith Jahveh, when I will take vengeance on her graven images; and through all her land shall the wounded groan. Ver. 53. Though Babylon ascended to heaven, and fortified the height of her strength, yet from me there shall come destroyers to her, saith Jahveh. Ver. 54. The noise of a cry [comes] from Babylon, and great destruction from the land of the Chaldeans. Ver. 55. For Jahveh lays waste Babylon, and destroys out of her the great noise; and her waves sound like many waters: a noise of their voice is uttered. Ver. 56. For there comes against her, against Babylon, a destroyer, and her heroes are taken; each one of their bows is broken: for Jahveh is a God of retributions, He shall certainly recompense. Ver. 57. And I will make drunk her princes and her wise men, her governors and her lieutenant-governors, and her heroes, so that they shall sleep an eternal sleep, and not awake, saith the King, whose

name is Jahveh of hosts. Ver. 58. Thus saith Jahveh of hosts: The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly destroyed, and her high gates shall be burned with fire, so that nations toil for nothing, and peoples for the fire, and thus are weary."

Once more there is addressed to Israel the call to return immediately; cf. ver. 45 and l. 8. The designation, "those who have escaped from the sword," is occasioned by the mention in ver. 49 of those who are slain: it is not to be explained (with Nägelsbach) from the circumstance that the prophet sees before him the massacre of the Babylonians as something that has already taken place. This view of the matter agrees neither with what precedes nor what follows, where the punishment of Babylon is set forth as yet to come. It is those who have escaped from the sword of Babylon during the exercise of its sway that are meant, not those who remain, spared in the conquest of Babylon. They are to go, not to stand or linger on the road, lest they be overtaken, with others, by the judgment falling upon Babylon; they are also to remember, from afar, Jahveh the faithful covenant God, and Jerusalem, that they may hasten their return. **הָלַכְתָּ** is a form of the imperative from **הָלַךְ**; it occurs only here, and has probably been chosen instead of **הָלַכְיָה**, because this form, in the actual use of language, had gradually lost its full meaning, and become softened down to a mere interjection, while emphasis is here placed on the *going*. After the call there follows, in ver. 51, the complaint, "We have lived to see the dishonour caused by the desecration of our sanctuary." This complaint does not permit of being taken as an answer or objection on the part of those who are summoned to return, somewhat in this spirit: "What is the good of our remembering Jahveh and Jerusalem? Truly we have thence a remembrance only of the deepest shame and dishonour" (Nägelsbach). Such an objection the prophet certainly would have answered with a reproof for the want or weakness of faith. Ewald accordingly takes ver. 51 as containing "a confession which the exiles make in tears, and filled with shame, regarding the previous state of dishonour in which they themselves, as well as the holy place, have been." On this view, those who are exhorted to return encourage themselves

by this confession and prayer to zeal in returning; and it would be necessary to supply *dicite* before ver. 51, and to take בָּשְׂנָן as meaning, “We are ashamed because we have heard scoffing, and because enemies have come into the holy places of Jahveh’s house.” But they might have felt no shame on account of this dishonour that befell them. בָּשָׂן signifies merely to be ashamed in consequence of the frustration of some hope, not the shame of repentance felt on doing wrong. Hence, with Calvin and others, we must take the words of ver. 51 as a scruple which the prophet expresses in the name of the people against the summons to remember Jahveh and Jerusalem, that he may remove the objection. The meaning is thus something like the following: “We may say, indeed, that disgrace has been imposed on us, for we have experienced insult and dishonour; but in return for this, Babylon will now be laid waste and destroyed.” The plural הַמִּקְדָּשִׁים denotes the different holy places of the temple, as in Ps. lxviii. 36. The answer which settles this objection is introduced, ver. 52, by the formula, “Therefore, behold, days are coming,” which connects itself with the contents of ver. 51: “Therefore, because we were obliged to listen to scoffing, and barbarians have forced their way into the holy places of the house of our God,—therefore will Jahveh punish Babylon for these crimes.” The suffixes in פְּסִילָה and אֲרָצָה refer to Babylon. חָלַל is used in undefined generality, “slain, pierced through.”—Ver. 53. Babylon shall by no means escape punishment. Even though it mounted up to heaven (cf. Job xx. 6; there may, at the same time, be an allusion to Isa. xiv. 12, and possibly also to the tower at Babylon), and תִּבְאַר, “cut off (*i.e.* made inaccessible) the height of its strength,” *i.e.* the height in which its strength consists, its lofty wall of defence (probably an allusion to the lofty walls of Babylon; see on ver. 58), yet destroyers are to come against it from Jahveh.—Ver. 54. The prophet in the spirit sees these destroyers as already come. A cry of anguish proceeds from Babylon, and great destruction; cf. l. 22, 46, and xlviii. 3. For (ver. 55) Jahveh lays waste Babylon, and destroys out of her קָרְזֵל, properly “the loud voice,” *i.e.* the loud noise and bustle of the city. “Their waves,” *i.e.* the surging masses of the conquering army, roar like many or great

waters; cf. Isa. xvii. 12. **קֹלָם שָׁאוֹן גַּתְּנָה**, lit. “there is given” (i.e. there sounds) “the noise of their voice,” i.e. of the roaring of their waves. “For there comes on Babylon a destroyer, so that her heroes are made prisoners, and her bows (by synecdoche for weapons) broken in pieces.” The Piel **חִתְּקָה** has here an intransitive sense, “to break or shiver into pieces,” like **חִתָּה**, Isa. xlvi. 8, lx. 11. This must take place, for Jahveh is a God of retribution; cf. ver. 24. This retribution He will execute in such a way as to make the princes, wise men, rulers, and heroes of Babylon sink down into an eternal sleep, by presenting to them the cup of wrath. On **הַשְּׁפֵרָה** and **וְיִשְׁנָה** and **וְיִשְׁרָאֵל**, cf. ver. 39. On the enumeration of the different classes of leaders and supporters of the state, cf. ver. 23 and l. 35; and on the designation of Jahveh as King, xlvi. 15, with the remark there made.—Ver. 58. And not only are the defenders of the city to fall, but the strong ramparts also, the broad walls and the lofty towers, are to be destroyed. The adjective **הַרְחָבָה** is joined in the singular with the plural **מִצְבָּה**, because the complex notion of the walls of Babylon, denoted by the latter word, is viewed as a unity; cf. Ewald, § 318. **עָרָע**, in Hithpael, means “to be made bare,” i.e. to be destroyed down to the ground; the inf. abs. Pilel is added to intensify the expression. Regarding the height and breadth and the extent of the walls of Babylon, cf. the collection of notices by the old writers in Duncker’s *Gesch. des Alt. i.* S. 856 ff. According to Herodotus (i. 178 f.), they were fifty ells [“royal cubits,” or nearly 85 feet] thick, and 200 ells [337½ feet] high; Ctesias assigns them a height of 300 feet, Strabo that of 50 ells [cubits, or 75 feet], and a breadth of 32 feet. On this Duncker remarks: “The height and breadth which Herodotus gives to the walls are no doubt exaggerated. Since the wall of Media, the first line of defence for the country, had a height of 100 feet and a breadth of 20 feet, and since Xenophon saw in Nineveh walls 150 feet in height, we shall be able with some degree of certainty to assume, in accordance with the statement of Pliny (vi. 26), that the wall of Babylon must have had a height of 200 feet above the ditch, and a proportionate breadth of from 30 to 40 feet. This breadth would be sufficient to permit of teams of four being driven along the rampart, between the

battlements, as Herodotus and Strabo inform us, without touching, just as the rampart on the walls of Nineveh is said to have afforded room for three chariots.”¹ The gates leading into the city were, according to Herodotus, *l.c.*, provided with beautifully ornamented gateways; the posts, the two leaves of the gates, and the thresholds, were of bronze. The prophecy concludes, ver. 58b, with some words from Hab. ii. 13, which are to be verified by the destruction of Babylon, viz. that the nations which have built Babylon, and made it great, have laboured in vain, and only wearied themselves. Habakkuk probably does not give this truth as a quotation from an older prophet, but rather declares it as an ordinance of God, that those who build cities with blood, and strongholds with unrighteousness, make nations toil to supply food for fire. Jeremiah has made use of the passage as a suitable conclusion to his prophecy, but made some unimportant alterations; for he has transposed the words בְּרִיךְ אֵשׁ and בְּרִיךְ יְעַפְּרֵא, and changed לְאַתִּים יְעַפְּרֵא into יְעַפְּרֵא, that he may conclude his address with greater emphasis. For, according to the arrangement here, לְאַתִּים יְעַפְּרֵא still depends on בְּרִיךְ אֵשׁ, and יְעַפְּרֵא indicates the result of this toil for the enslaved nations,—they only weary themselves thereby. The genuineness of this reading is put beyond a doubt by the repetition of יְעַפְּרֵא at the close of the epilogue in ver. 64. What Habakkuk said generally of the undertakings

¹ For details as to the number of the walls, and statistics regarding them, see Duncker, S. 858, Anm. 3, who is inclined to understand the notice of Berosus regarding a triple wall as meaning that the walls of the river are counted as the second, and those round the royal fortress as the third line of circumvallation. J. Oppert, *Exped. en Mésop.* i. p. 220 ff., has given a thorough discussion of this question. By carefully comparing the accounts of the ancient writers regarding the walls of Babylon, and those given in the inscriptions, lately discovered and deciphered, found on the buildings of Sennacherib and Nebuchadnezzar, with the vast extent of the long mounds of rubbish on the places where the ruins are met with, he has obtained this result,—that the city was surrounded by a strong double wall with deep ditches, an outer and an inner *enceinte*, and that the outer or large wall enclosed a space of 513 square kilometres, *i.e.* a piece of ground as large as the department of the Seine, fifteen times the extent of the city of Paris in the year 1859, seven times that of the same city in 1860, while the second or inner wall enclosed an area of 290 square kilometres, much larger than the space occupied by London.

of the Chaldeans, Jeremiah applied specially to the fall of the city of Babylon, because it was to exhibit its fulfilment most plainly in that event.

Vers. 59-64. *Epilogue*.—Ver. 59. “The word which Jeremiah the prophet commanded Seraiah the son of Nerijah, the son of Maaseiah, when he went with Zedekiah the king of Judah to Babylon, in the fourth year of his reign. Now Seraiah was ‘quartermaster-general’” (Ger. *Reisemarschall*).¹ Seraiah the son of Nerijah was, no doubt, a brother of Baruch the son of Nerijah; cf. xxxii. 12. שָׁרֵן נָמָתָה does not mean “a peaceful prince” (Luther), [“a quiet prince,” English Version], but “prince of the resting-place” (cf. Num. x. 33), i.e. the king’s “quartermaster-general.” What Jeremiah commanded Seraiah, or charged him with, does not follow till ver. 61; for the words of ver. 60, “And Jeremiah wrote in a book all the evil that was to come on Babylon, [namely] all these words which are written against Babylon” (in the preceding address, chap. l. and li.), form a parenthetic remark, inserted for the purpose of explaining the charge that follows. This remark is attached to the circumstantial clause at the end of ver. 59, after which “the word which he commanded” is not resumed till ver. 61, with the words, “and Jeremiah spake to Seraiah;” and the charge itself is given in vers. 61b-64: “When thou comest to Babylon, then see to it, and read all these words, and say, O Jahveh, Thou hast spoken against this place, to destroy it, so that there shall be no inhabitant in it, neither man nor beast, but it shall be eternal desolations. And it shall be, when thou hast finished reading this book, that thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of the Euphrates (ver. 64), and say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise again, because of the evil that I bring upon her; and they shall be weary.”

¹ The Peshito renders שָׁרֵן נָמָתָה by “chief of the camp,” evidently reading מָתָן. Gesenius, following in this line, thought that Seraiah held an office in the Babylonian army similar to that of quartermaster-general. It is evident, however, that he was rather an officer of the Jewish court in attendance on the king. Maurer, who is followed by Hitzig, and here by Keil, in his rendering “*Reisemarschall*,” suggested the idea that he was a functionary who took charge of the royal caravan when on the march, and fixed the halting-place.—Tr.

כִּי־בָּאָתָךְ בָּבֶל does not mean, "when thou shalt have got near Babylon, so that thou beholdest the city lying in its full extent before thee" (Hitzig), but, according to the simple tenor of the words, "when thou shalt have come into the city." The former interpretation is based on the erroneous supposition that Seraiah had not been able to read the prophecy in the city, from fear of being called to account for this by the Babylonians. But it is nowhere stated that he was to read it publicly to the Babylonians themselves in an assembly of the people expressly convened for this purpose, but merely that he is to read it, and afterwards throw the book into the Euphrates. The reading was not intended to warn the Babylonians of the destruction threatened them, but was merely to be a proclamation of the word of the Lord against Babylon, on the very spot, for the purpose of connecting with it the symbolic action mentioned in ver. 63 f. וְרָאָתָּה does not belong to ("when thou comest to Babylon, and seest"), but introduces the apodosis, "then see to it, and read," i.e. keep it in your eye, in your mind, that you read (cf. Gen. xx. 10); not, "seek a good opportunity for reading" (Ewald). At the same time, Seraiah is to cry to God that He has said He will bring this evil on Babylon, i.e. as it were to remind God that the words of the prophecy are His own words, which He has to fulfil. On the contents of ver. 62, cf. l. 3, li. 26. After the reading is finished, he is to bind the book to a stone, by means of which to sink it in the Euphrates, uttering the words explanatory of this action, "Thus shall Babylon sink," etc. This was to be done, not for the purpose of destroying the book (which certainly took place, but was not the object for which it was sunk), but in order to symbolize the fulfilment of the prophecy against Babylon. The attachment of the stone was not a precautionary measure to prevent the writing from being picked up somewhere, and thus bringing the writer or the people of the caravan into trouble (Hitzig), but was merely intended to make sure that the book would sink down into the depths of the Euphrates, and render it impossible that it should rise again to the surface, thus indicating by symbol that Babylon would not rise again. The words which Seraiah is to speak on throwing the book into the Euphrates, contain, *in nuce*, the

substance of the prophecy. The prophet makes this still more plain, by concluding the words he is likewise to utter with יְמַלֵּא as the last word of the prophecy. Luther has here well rendered יְמַלֵּא, "to weary," by "succumb" (*erliegen*). The Babylonians form the subject of יְמַלֵּא.¹ The symbolic meaning of this act is clear; and from it, also, the meaning of the whole charge to the prophet is not difficult to perceive. The sending of the prophecy through Seraiah, with the command to read it there, at the same time looking up to God, and then to sink it in the Euphrates, was not intended as a testimony to the inhabitants of Babylon of the certainty of their destruction, but was meant to be a substantial proof for Israel that God the Lord would, without fail, fulfil His word regarding the seventy years' duration of Babylon's supremacy, and the fall of this great kingdom which was to ensue. This testimony received still greater significance from the circumstances under which it was given. The journey of King Zedekiah to Babylon was, at least in regard to its official purpose, an act of homage shown by Zedekiah to Nebuchadnezzar, as the vassal of the king of Babylon. This fact, which was deeply humiliating for Judah, was made use of by Jeremiah, in the name of the Lord, for the purpose of announcing and transmitting to Babylon, the city that ruled the world, the decree which Jahveh, the God of Israel, as King of heaven and earth, had formed concerning the proud city, and which He would execute in His own time,

¹ Mistaking the meaning of the repetition of the word יְמַלֵּא, Movers, Hitzig, and Graf have thereon based various untenable conjectures. Movers infers from the circumstance that the whole epilogue is spurious; Hitzig and Graf conclude from it that the closing words, "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah," originally came after ver. 58, and that the epilogue, because it does not at all admit of being separated from the great oracle against Babylon, originally preceded the oracle beginning l. 1, but was afterwards placed at the end; moreover, that the transposer cut off from ver. 58 the concluding remark, "Thus far," etc., and put it at the end of the epilogue (ver. 64), but, at the same time, also transferred יְמַלֵּא, in order to show that the words, *i.e.* the prophecies of Jeremiah, strictly speaking, extend only thus far. This intimation is, indeed, quite superfluous, for it never could occur to the mind of any intelligent reader that the epilogue, vers. 59-64, was an integral portion of the prophecy itself. And there would be no meaning in placing the epilogue before l. 1.

that He might confirm the hope of the godly ones among His people in the deliverance of Israel from Babylon.

The statement, "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah," is an addition made by the editor of the prophecies. From these words, it follows that chap. lii. does not belong to these prophecies, but forms a historical appendix to them.

Finally, if any question be asked regarding the fulfilment of the prophecy against Babylon, we must keep in mind these two points: 1. The prophecy, as is shown both by its title and its contents, is not merely directed against the city of Babylon, but also against the land of the Chaldeans. It therefore proclaims generally the devastation and destruction of the Chaldean kingdom, or the fall of the Babylonian empire; and the capture and destruction of Babylon, the capital, receive special prominence only in so far as the world-wide rule of Babylon fell with the capital, and the supremacy of the Chaldeans over the nations came to an end. 2. In addition to this historical side, the prophecy has an ideal background, which certainly is never very prominent, but nevertheless is always more or less to be discovered. Here Babylon, as the then mistress of the world, is the representative of the God-opposing influences on the earth, which always attempt to suppress and destroy the kingdom of God. The fulfilment of the historical side of this prophecy began with the capture of Babylon by the united forces of the Medes and Persians under the leadership of Cyrus, and with the dissolution of the Chaldean empire, brought about through that event. By this means, too, the people of Israel were delivered from the Babylonish captivity, while Cyrus gave them permission to return to their native land and rebuild the temple of the Lord in Jerusalem; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22 f., Ezra i. 1 ff. But Babylon was not destroyed when thus taken, and according to Herodotus, iii. 159, even the walls of the city remained uninjured, while, according to a notice of Berossus in Josephus, *contra Ap.* i. 19, Cyrus is said to have given orders for the pulling down of the outer wall. Cyrus appointed Babylon, after Susa and Ecbatana, the third city in the kingdom, and the winter residence of the Persian kings (according to Xenophon, *Cyrop.* viii. 6. 22). Darius Hystaspes, who was obliged to take the city a second time, in consequence

of its revolt in the year 518 B.C., was the first who caused the walls to be lowered in height; these were diminished to 50 ells [royal cubits—about 85 feet], and the gates were torn away (Herodotus, iii. 158 f.). Xerxes spoiled the city of the golden image of Belus (Herodot. i. 183), and caused the temple of Belus to be destroyed (Arrian, vii. 17. 2). Alexander the Great had intended not merely to rebuild the sanctuary of Belus, but also to make the city the capital of his empire; but he was prevented by his early death from carrying out this plan. The decay of Babylon properly began when Seleucus Nicator built Seleucia, on the Tigris, only 300 stadia distant. “*Babylon*,” says Pliny, vi. 30, “*ad solitudinem rediit, exhausta vicinitate Seleuciæ*.” And Strabo (born 60 B.C.) says that, even in his time, the city was a complete wilderness, to which he applies the utterance of a poet: ἐρημίᾳ μεγάλῃ ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη πόλις (xvi. 1. 5). This decay was accelerated under the rule of the Parthians, so that, within a short time, only a small space within the walls was inhabited, while the rest was used as fields (Diodorus Siculus, ii. 9; Curtius, v. 4. 27). According to the statements of Jerome and Theodoret, there were still living at Babylon, centuries afterwards, a pretty considerable number of Jews; but Jerome (*ad Jerem.* 51) was informed by a Persian monk that these ruins stood in the midst of a hunting district of the Persian kings. The notices of later writers, especially of modern travellers, have been collected by Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xi. S. 865 f.; and the latest investigations among the ruins are described in his *Expédition scient. en Mésopotamie*, i. pp. 135-254 (Paris, 1863).¹ John the evangelist has taken the ideal elements of this prophecy into his apocalyptic description of the great city of Babylon (Rev. xvi. ff.), whose fall is not to begin till the kingdom of God is completed in glory through the return of our Lord.

¹ Fresh interest in Babylonian archæology has of late been awakened, especially in this country, by Mr. George Smith, of the British Museum, who has collected and deciphered about eighty fragments of some tablets that had been brought from Assyria, and that give an account of the deluge different in some respects from the Mosaic one. The proprietors of the *Daily Telegraph* have also shown much public spirit in sending out, at their own cost, an expedition to Assyria, for further investigation of the ruins there.—TR.

APPENDIX.

CHAP. LII.—HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE CAPTURE AND DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM, THE FATE OF ZEDEKIAH AND THE PEOPLE, AND THE LIBERATION OF JEHOIACHIN FROM IMPRISONMENT.

By the closing formula, li. 64, the contents of chap. lii. are separated from, and marked as an appendix to, the prophecies of Jeremiah; yet nothing is said regarding the author of this chapter. However, if we keep in mind the nature of its contents, then, from the very fact that it gives an account of the liberation of King Jehoiachin from prison, and of his elevation to royal honours, it necessarily follows that it cannot have been composed by Jeremiah, because the prophet can scarcely have lived till this occurred, which was less than 561 B.C. It must further be considered that the contents of this chapter also agree, almost word for word, with 2 Kings xxiv. 18–25, 30; moreover, the introductory notice regarding Zedekiah's ascension of the throne, his age, and the character of his rule, given vers. 1–3, was unnecessary for the object of this appendix. The same holds true of the notice regarding the liberation of Jehoiachin from prison, at the close, vers. 31–34, which does not seem to stand in any close and intimate connection with the history of the destruction of Jerusalem and the fate of Zedekiah, while both of these events are closely connected with the plan and aim of the Books of Kings, and are written quite in their spirit. On these grounds, most expositors, both ancient and modern, assume that this historical appendix to the prophecies of Jeremiah has been derived from the Second Book of Kings. But weighty reasons oppose this assumption. (1.) The very fact that the name of the king of Babylon is throughout written *Nebuchadrezzar* makes it unlikely that the narrative was derived from 2 Kings xxiv. 18 ff., because the name is there constantly written *Nebuchadnezzar*,—a form which also occurs in Jeremiah, though not often (see vol. i. p. 397, note). (2.) This chapter contains notices which are not found in 2 Kings xxiv. and xxv. Thus, it is stated, in ver. 10, that Nebuchadrezzar also caused all the princes of Judah to be executed at

Riblah, and King Zedekiah, who had been carried to Babylon, to be put in prison till his death ; in vers. 19-23 we find a whole series of special remarks as to the vessels of the temple and the ornaments of the brazen pillars,—observations which are not met with either in 2 Kings xxv., or in the description of the building of the temple, 1 Kings vii. We further find, in vers. 28-30, a notice regarding three deportations of the people, giving the numbers, not roundly, but precisely, as they are nowhere else given in the historical books of the Old Testament. Were this statement the only additional detail given by this chapter, as compared with 2 Kings xxv., one might perhaps suppose that it was an interpolation from another source, added to the rest of the account that has been derived from 2 Kings xxiv. and xxv.; but this opinion, which even in itself is not very probable, is excluded by the other additions found in ver. 10 and in 19-23. If the author of this chapter had been able to derive, and had actually derived, these additional particulars from a historical source, treating of the later times of the kingdom of Judah, which has not come down to us, and which contained more than our canonical books of Kings and Chronicles, he would no doubt have also found there the account of the three deportations, and taken it from that source. We must therefore assume that this chapter, and 2 Kings xxiv. 18 on to xxv. 30, have both a common origin, in which the fall of the kingdom of Judah was more fully described than in the historical books of the canon ; in this way, the remarkable coincidence, almost word for word, between the narrative portions which are common to the two extracts, is accounted for quite as easily as the differences that have just been mentioned. From a critical examination of the state of both texts now before us, no certain conclusions can be drawn regarding their mutual relation. The differences of this kind arise partly from errors and omissions by later copyists, partly also from the circumstance that the epitomizers have not throughout kept rigorously to the words of their source. Regarding the author of the original written document, we cannot even make any supposition that could pretend to anything like probability. Baruch, as the editor of the collection of Jeremiah's prophecies, may have made the extract from it which we find in this chapter. We have already,

in substance, given the exposition while treating of 2 Kings xxiv. 18 ff., so that we may here content ourselves with briefly putting together the deviations of this text from the other, and explaining its peculiarities.

Vers. 1-11. Fate of King Zedekiah at the taking of Jerusalem; cf. 2 Kings xxiv. 18, xxv. 7, and Jer. xxxix. 1-7. The statements regarding Zedekiah's ascension and his government, vers. 1-3, agree word for word with 2 Kings xxiv. 18-20, even to the variation **הַשְׁלִיבָנָה**, ver. 3, for (Kings). The length of the siege of Jerusalem, vers. 4-7a, and the flight, capture, and condemnation of King Zedekiah and the princes of Judah, vers. 7b-11, not only agrees with 2 Kings xxv. 1-7, but also with Jer. xxxix. 1-7, where it is merely the forcible entrance into the city by the Chaldeans that receives special detail; see on xxxix. 3. The variation **וַיַּחַנֵּן**, ver. 4, instead of **וַיַּעֲמֹד** (2 Kings xxv. 1), does not affect the sense. As to the account given of the flight, capture, and condemnation of the king, both chap. xxxix. and 2 Kings xxv. omit the notices given in ver. 10, "and also all the princes of Judah he caused to be slain (i.e. executed) at Riblah," and in ver. 11, "and he put him in the prison-house till the day of his death." **בֵּית־דָּקָרָה** has been rendered *oikia μυλῶνος* by the LXX.; on this fact Hitzig bases the opinion that the Hebrew words signify "the house of punishment," or "the house of correction," in which Zedekiah was obliged to turn the mill like other culprits, and as Samson was once obliged to do (Judg. xvi. 21). But this meaning of the words cannot be substantiated. **פְּקָרָה** means "oversight, mustering, or visitation (*Heimsuchung*), or vengeance," e.g. Isa. x. 3, but not punishment (*Strafe*), and the plural, "watches" (Ezek. ix. 1) and "custody," Ezek. xliv. 11; hence the expression used here signifies "the house of custody," or "the house of the watches." The translation of the LXX. can decide nothing against this, because their interpretation is based upon traditions which are themselves unfounded. Regarding this, Ewald well remarks (*History of the People of Israel*, iii. p. 748 of 2d ed.): "That Zedekiah must have laboured at the mill, as is mentioned in later chronicles (see Aug. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, t. i. P. 2, p. 6; cf. *Chron. Sam.* chap. xlvi.), is probably a mere inference from Lam. v. 13."

Vers. 12-23. The destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, and the carrying away of the people, which are only very summarily stated in chap. xxxix. 8-10, are here related in complete accordance with the account given in 2 Kings xxv. 8-17. The deviations for the most part originated through the freedom exercised by the epitomizer in his work, or only when mistakes were made by later copyists. The text before us has some amplifications (especially the notices regarding the ornaments of the brazen pillars, ver. 23) which are found nowhere else in the Old Testament. The difference in date between ver. 12 ("on the tenth of the month") and the passage in Kings ("on the *seventh* of the month") has arisen through one number having been mistaken for another in copying; it cannot now be decided which is correct; see on 2 Kings xxv. 18. As to Nebuzaradan, see on xxxix. 13. Instead of לְפָנָי, is found עַבְרָי in 2 Kings xxv. 8, which certainly is a simpler reading, but one having less appearance of being the original. The only strange point is the want of the relative אֲשֶׁר in plain prose before עַבְרָי, which is probably to be pointed עַבְרָד. Instead of יְרֵשָׁלָם (Kings), is a pregnant expression for "he came into Jerusalem."—Ver. 14. From the expression אֲלֹהִים-חַוּמוֹת as given in ver. 14, "all" is omitted in Kings, as being not indispensable for the meaning.—Ver. 15. The first words, "And of the poor of the people," are wanting in Kings, and have been brought here, through an error on the part of the copyist, from the beginning of the next verse; for "the poor of the people" are first treated of in ver. 16, where it is stated that Nebuzaradan left them in the land, while ver. 15 treats of those who were carried away to Babylon. The word הָעָמִין, instead of קָהָלָם (Kings), seems to have originated simply through the exchange of ש for מ, and to mean, like the other, the multitude of people. Hitzig and Graf are of opinion that מָמוֹן here, as in Prov. viii. 30, means workmaster or artificer, and that הָעָמִין denotes the same persons (collectively) who are designated שְׁחַרְשָׁן in xxiv. 1, xxix. 2, and 2 Kings xxiv. 14. But this view is opposed by the parallel passage, xxxix. 9, where the whole of this verse occurs, and יְתַחַר הָעָם הַנְּשָׁאָרִים stands instead of הָעָמִין. "The rest of the people of Jerusalem" are divided, by יְתַחַר—וְאַתָּה, into those who went over to the Chaldeans, and the

rest of the people who were taken prisoners by the Chaldeans at the capture of the city. The statement that both of these two classes of the population of Jerusalem were carried away to Babylon is so far limited by the further declaration, in ver. 16, that Nebuzaradan did not carry away every one, without exception, but let a portion of the humbler inhabitants of the country, who had no property, remain in the land, as vine-dressers and husbandmen, that they might till the land. Instead of פְּלִתָּה there occurs in Kings פְּלִתָּה הָאָרֶץ, and in Jer. xxxix. 10, more distinctly, פְּנֵן הַעַם הַרְלִים, “some of the people, the humbler ones,” who had no property of their own. פְּלִתָּה, pl. פְּלִתּוֹת, is an abstract noun, “poverty;” the singular is used collectively, hence the plural is here used to supply the deficiency. For יְנַבֵּם, from נַבֵּם, to plough, there is found instead, in 2 Kings xxv. 12, *Kethib* גַּבְּבִים, from גַּבְּבָה, with the same meaning.—Vers. 17–23. The carrying away of the vessels of the temple is more fully stated than in 2 Kings xxv. 13–17. The large brazen articles, the two pillars at the porch (cf. 1 Kings vii. 15 ff.), the bases (1 Kings vii. 27 ff.), and the brazen sea (1 Kings vii. 23 ff.), which were too vast in their proportions to be easily carried away to Babylon, were broken to pieces by the Chaldeans, who carried off the brass of which they were made. אֲשֶׁר לְבִתְהַדְּרוּקִים is more correct than אֲשֶׁר בֵּית (Kings), and “all their brass” is more precise than simply “their brass” (Kings). In the enumeration of the smaller brazen vessels used for the temple service, ver. 18, there is omitted, in 2 Kings, וְאַתְּהַדְּרוּקִים, “and the bowls” (used in sacrifice); this omission is perhaps due merely to an error in transcription. The enumeration of the gold and silver vessels in ver. 19 has been much more abbreviated in 2 Kings xxv. 15, where only “the fire-pans and the bowls” are mentioned, while in the text here, besides these there are named “the basons,” then “the pots (Eng. vers. *caldrons*), and the candlesticks, and the pans (Eng. vers. *spoons*), and the cups.” For particulars regarding these different vessels, see on 1 Kings vii. 40, 45, 50. In ver. 20, reference is made to the fact that the mass of metal in the vessels that were carried away was without weight. The same is stated in 2 Kings xxv. 16, where, however, there is no mention of the twelve brazen bulls; while in the text of Jeremiah, אֲשֶׁר תַּחַת

אשר תחתיו והפכנות הפקנوت is faulty, and we must read instead, The assertion of Graf, in his commentary on this verse, and of Thenius on 2 Kings xxv. 16,—that the notice regarding the twelve brazen bulls is incorrect, because these were then no longer in Jerusalem (xxvii. 19), but had previously been removed by Ahaz from under the brazen sea for Tiglath-pileser,—we have already, under 2 Kings xvi. 17, shown to be erroneous. The apposition of *האלֹהִים הַכִּילִים* to *כל-חֶכְלִים* *לְנַחֲשָׂתָם* explains the reference of the suffix. In vers. 21-23, the narrator, in order to call attention to the amount of art exhibited on the vessels destroyed by the Chaldeans, gives a brief description of the brazen pillars with their capitals. This description is much shortened in 2 Kings xxv. 17, and contains notices completing that which is given of these works of art in 1 Kings vii. For details, see the passage referred to.

Vers. 24-27. The account given regarding the arrest of the chief officers of the temple and of the city, and concerning their transportation to Riblah, where Nebuchadnezzar caused them to be executed, agrees with 2 Kings xxv. 18-21, except in some unimportant variations, which, however, do not alter the sense; the explanation has been already given in the commentary on that passage. In 2 Kings xxv., the account of the appointment of Gedaliah as the governor of Judah, together with that of his assassination by Ishmael, which follows the narrative just referred to, is here omitted, because the matter has been already more fully stated in the passage chap. xl. 7 on to xlii. 7, and had no close connection with the object of the present chapter. Instead of this, there follows here, in vers. 28-30 (as a continuation of the remark made, ver. 27, "Thus was Judah carried away captive out of his own land"), a calculation of the number of the Jews taken to Babylon at the three deportations; in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar, 3023 Jews; in the eighteenth year, 832 souls from Jerusalem; and in the twenty-third year, 745 souls,—in all, 4600 persons. The correctness of these data is vouched for by the exactness of the separate numbers, and the agreement of the sum with the individual items. In other respects, however, they present various difficulties. There is, first, the chronological discrepancy that the second deportation is here placed in the eighteenth year of

Nebuchadnezzar, in contradiction with ver. 12, according to which, the deportation after the taking of Jerusalem occurred in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar; and 832 souls could not well be carried out of Jerusalem during the siege. This difference can be settled only by assuming that this list of deportations was derived from another source than the preceding notice regarding the destruction of Jerusalem, in which the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign were reckoned in some other way than elsewhere in Jeremiah and in the books of Kings, probably from the date of the actual commencement of his reign, which followed a year after he first appeared in Judah, from which his reign is dated elsewhere; see on Dan. i. 1 (p. 59 ff.). According to this mode of computation, the seventh year would correspond to the eighth of the common reckoning, and be the year in which Jehoiachin was carried away to Babylon, together with a large number of the people. But this does not agree with 3023, which is given as the number of those who were carried away; for, at that time, according to 2 Kings xxiv. 14, 16, as many as 10,000 Jews, or, according to another view of these verses, even 18,000, were carried away to Babylon. This difference does not permit of being explained in any way. Ewald (*History of the People of Israel*, iii. p. 738) accordingly assumes that in ver. 28, after יָמֵן, the word שָׁנָה has been omitted, as in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, where the age of Jehoiachin is given; hence he thinks that, instead of "in the seventh," we must read "in the seventeenth year of Nebuchadnezzar." On such a view, the reference would be to a deportation which took place under Zedekiah, a year before the capture, or during the time of the siege of Jerusalem, and that, too, out of the country districts of Judah in contrast with Jerusalem, ver. 29. This supposition is favoured not merely by the small number of those who are said to have been carried away, but also by the context of the narrative, inasmuch as, in what precedes, it is only the capture of Jerusalem and the deportation of the people in Zedekiah's time that is treated of. Nägelsbach has objected to this supposition, that it was not likely the great mass of the people would be carried away during the war, at a time when the approach of the Egyptian army (cf. xxxvii. 5) was an object of

dread. But the objection does not weaken the supposition, since the former rests on two presuppositions that are quite erroneous: viz., first, that the deportation took place before the defeat of the auxiliary army from Egypt, whereas it may have followed that event; and secondly, that the Chaldeans, by keeping the hostile Jews in the country, might have been able to get some assistance against the Egyptian army, whereas, by removing the hostile population of Judah, they would but diminish the number of the enemies with which they had to contend. We therefore regard this conjecture as highly probable, because it is the means of settling all difficulties, and because we can thereby account for the small number of those who were carried away in the deportations during and after the destruction of Jerusalem. Regarding the third deportation, which was effected by Nebuzaradan (ver. 30) in the twenty-third, or, according to another reckoning, in the twenty-fourth year of Nebuchadnezzar, *i.e.* in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, we have no other information; for the statement of Josephus, *Antt.* x. 9. 7, that Nebuchadnezzar made war upon the Ammonites and Moabites in that year, has not been placed beyond a doubt, and is probably a mere inference from this verse, taken in connection with the prophecies in chap. xlviij. and xlix. Yet there is nothing improbable in the statement, viewed by itself. For it must be borne in mind that, after the appointment of Gedaliah as governor, and the departure of the Chaldean hosts, many Jews, who had fled during the war, returned into the country. Hence, in spite of the fact that, after the murder of Gedaliah, a multitude of Jews, fearing the vengeance of the Chaldeans, fled to Egypt, many may have still remained in the country; and many other fugitives may not have returned till afterwards, and given occasion to the Chaldeans for removing other 745 disturbers of the peace to Babylon, four or five years after Jerusalem had been laid in ashes. This deportation may have taken place on the occasion of the subjugation of the Moabites, Ammonites, and Idumeans, or during the war with the Phoenicians, possibly because they had rendered assistance to these nations against the Chaldeans. These verses thus contain nothing to justify the assumption of M. von Niebuhr (*Gesch. Assyr. und Babels*, S. 58, note) and

Nägelsbach, that they are a gloss. The paucity of those who were carried away is not to be attributed to a desire on the part of the writer of this inserted portion to represent the calamity as not so very terrible after all; nor is it due to the substitution of the number of the Levites for that of the entire people,—two wholly arbitrary assumptions: it is completely explained by a consideration of the historical circumstances. The best of the population of Judah had already been carried away, and Zedekiah and his counsellors must have said to themselves, when they rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar, that the latter would not spare this time; thus they must have defended themselves to the utmost, as is shown by the very fact that the siege of Jerusalem lasted eighteen months. In this manner, war, pestilence, and famine carried off a great number of the population of Jerusalem; so that, of men who were able-bodied and fit for war, and who could be carried into exile, not more than 4600 fell into the hands of the Chaldeans. During the war, also, many had concealed themselves in inaccessible places, while the lowest of the people were left behind in the country to cultivate the fields. Still more strange might appear the circumstance that the sum-total of those who were carried away to Babylon, viz. 10,000 with Jehoiachin, and 4600 under Zedekiah,—14,600 in all,—is evidently disproportionate to the number of those who returned to Jerusalem and Judah under Zerubbabel, which number is given in Ezra ii. 64 at 42,360, exclusive of men and maid servants. For this reason, Graf is of opinion that still later deportations may have taken place, of which no mention is made anywhere. This assumption, however, has little probability. On the other hand, we must consider these points: (1.) In the accounts given of those who were carried away, only full-grown and independent persons of the male sex are reckoned, while, along with fathers, both their wives and their children went into exile. (2.) Even so early as the first capture of Jerusalem in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, a number of prisoners of war, perhaps not inconsiderable, came to Babylon; these might unite with the thousands of their brethren who were carried thither at a later period. (3.) When the exiles had settled down in Babylon, and there found not only a means of livelihood, but even in

many instances, as is clear from several intimations, attained to opulence as citizens, many, even of those who had been left in the country, may have gone to Babylon, in the hope of finding there greater prosperity than in Judah, now laid waste and depopulated by war. (4.) From the time when the 10,000 were carried away with Jehoiachin, in the year 599 B.C., till the return under Zerubbabel, 536 B.C., 63 years, *i.e.* nearly two generations, had passed, during which the exiles might largely increase in numbers. If we take all these elements into consideration, then, in the simple fact that the number of those who returned amounts to nearly three times the numbers of those given as having been carried away under Jehoiachin and Zedekiah, we cannot find such a difficulty as entitles us to doubt the correctness of the numbers handed down to us.

Vers. 31-34. The closing portion of this chapter, viz. the notice regarding the liberation of Jehoiachin from imprisonment, and his elevation to royal honours by Evil-merodach after Nebuchadnezzar's death, substantially agrees with the account given of that event in 2 Kings xxv. 27-30. The difference of date, "on the twenty-fifth of the month" (ver. 31), and "on the twenty-seventh of the month" in 2 Kings, has arisen through the entrance of a clerical error into one text or the other. The few remaining variations of the two texts have no influence on the meaning. As to the fact itself, and its importance for the people languishing in exile, we may refer to the explanation given at 2 Kings xxv. 27 ff.



THE

LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.



THE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH.

INTRODUCTION.

§ 1. THE NAME, CONTENTS, AND ARRANGEMENT OF THE BOOK.

THE NAME.—The five Lamentations composed on the fall of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah, which have received their position in the canon of the Old Testament among the Hagiographa, have for their heading, in Hebrew MSS. and in printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, the word אֲלֹהֶה ("alas! how . . ."), which forms the characteristic initial word of three of these pieces (i. 1, ii. 1, and iv. 1). The Rabbis name the collection קִנּוֹת (Lamentations), from the nature of its contents: so in the Talmud (*Tract. Baba Bathra*, f. 14b); cf. Jerome in the *Prol. galeat*, and in the prologue to his translation: "*incipiunt Threni, i.e. lamentationes, quæ Cynoth hebraice inscribuntur.*" With this agree the designations Θρῆνοι (LXX.), and *Threni* or *Lamentationes*, also *Lamenta* in the Vulgate and among the Latin writers.

CONTENTS.—The ancient custom of composing and singing lamentations over deceased friends (of which we find proof in the elegies of David on Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. i. 17 ff., and on Abner, 2 Sam. iii. 33 ff., and in the notice given in 2 Chron. xxxv. 25) was even in early times extended so as to apply to the general calamities that befell countries and cities; hence the prophets often speak of taking up lamentations over the fall of nations, countries, and cities; cf. Amos v. 1, Jer. vii. 29, ix. 9, 17 f., Ezek. xix. 1, xxvi. 17, xxvii. 2, etc. The five lamentations of the book now before us all refer to the

destruction of Jerusalem and of the kingdom of Judah by the Chaldeans; in them are deplored the unutterable misery that has befallen the covenant people in this catastrophe, and the disgrace which the fallen daughter of Zion has thereby suffered. This subject is treated of in the five poems from different points of view. In the *first*, the lamentation is chiefly made over the carrying away of the people into captivity, the desolation of Zion, the acts of oppression, the plundering and the starvation connected with the taking of Jerusalem, the scoffing and contempt shown by the enemy, and the helpless and comfortless condition of the city, now fallen so low. In the *second*, the destruction of Jerusalem and Judah is set forth as an act of God's wrath against the sins of the people, the impotency of human comfort in the midst of the terrible calamity is shown, and the people are exhorted to seek help from the Lord. In the *third*, the deep spiritual sufferings of God's people in the midst of the general distress form the subject of grievous complaint, out of which the soul endeavours to rise, and to see the compassion of the Lord, and the justice of His dealings on earth generally, as well as in this visitation of judgment; and on this is founded the confident expectation of help. In the *fourth*, the dreadful misery that has befallen Zion's citizens of every class is represented as a punishment for the grievous sins of the people and their leaders. And lastly, in the *fifth*, the Lord is entreated to remove the disgrace from His people and restore them to their former state of grace. According to this view, one may readily perceive in these poems a well-cogitated plan in the treatment of the material common to the whole, and a distinct progress in the execution of this plan. There is no foundation, on the other hand, for the opinion of De Wette, that a gradation may be traced in the description given of the condition of the city; and the attempt of earlier expositors (Horrer, Pareau, Jahn, etc.) to explain and apply the contents of the different poems to different leading features in the Chaldean catastrophe—such as the siege, the capture, the destruction of the city and the temple—has entirely failed. Ewald, again, assumes that the five poems were composed for a time to be solemnly spent in sorrow and penitence, and that in the five lamentations the prophet-writer presents a kind of

changing act (drama), making five different acts follow each other progressively; and further, that it is only with the changing series of these that the entire great act of real lamentation and divine sorrow concludes. But neither in the design nor in the execution of these poems are any points to be found which form a safe foundation for this assumption. Ewald is so far correct, however, in his general remark, that the prophetic composer sought to present to the community, in their deep sorrow, words which were meant to direct the grieving heart to the only source of true comfort; and that he understood how “to lead the deeply sorrowing ones imperceptibly to a proper knowledge of themselves and of their own great guilt, and thereby, in the first place, to true sorrow and sighing; that he also knew how to resolve the wildest grief at last into true prayer for divine retribution, and to change new strength into rejoicing over the everlasting Messianic hope, and into the most touching request for the divine compassion” (*Die Dichter des Alt. Bundes*, 3 Ansg. i. 2, S. 322).

FORM.—In order to give an air of continuity as well as of exhaustive completeness to the lamentation, which constantly assumes new figures and turns of thought, the poems, with the exception of the last (chap. v.), are alphabetically arranged, and in such a form that the first three consist of long stanzas, each of three lines, which are for the most part further divided about the middle by a cæsura into two portions of unequal length. These poems are so arranged in accordance with the letters of the alphabet, that in the first two, every verse of three lines, and in the third, every line in the verse, begins with the letters of the alphabet in their order. In this last [third] poem, moreover, all the letters of the alphabet occur thrice in succession, for which reason the Masoretes have divided these lines of the verses as if each formed a complete verse. In the fourth poem, the verses, which are also arranged and marked alphabetically, consist only of lines which are likewise divided into two by a cæsura; in the fifth, the alphabetic arrangement of the verses is departed from, and it is only in their number that the verses of the poem are made like the letters of the alphabet. This alphabetic arrangement of the verses is exactly carried out in the four poems, but with the remarkable

difference, that in the first only does the order of the letters entirely agree with the traditional arrangement of the alphabet, while, in the other three, the verse beginning with **ד** stands before that beginning with **י**. This deviation from the rule does not admit of being explained by the assumption that the verses in question were afterwards transposed in consequence of an oversight on the part of the copyist, nor by the supposition that the order of the letters had not yet been absolutely fixed. The former assumption, adopted by Kennicott, Jahn, etc., is shown to be utterly incorrect, by the circumstance that the supposed transmutation cannot be reconciled with the course of thought in the poems; while the latter, which has been maintained by C. B. Michaelis, Ewald, etc., is disproved by the fact that no change has taken place in the order of the letters in the Shemitic alphabets (cf. Sommer, *Bibl. Abhandl.* i. S. 145; Gesenius, § 5, Rem. 2; Ewald, § 12, a); and other alphabetic poems, such as Ps. cxii., cxiii., cxix., and Prov. xxxi. 10-31, exactly preserve the common arrangement of the letters. Still less does the irregularity in question permit of being attributed to an oversight on the part of the composer (which is Bertholdt's view), for the irregularity is repeated in three poems. It is rather connected with another circumstance. For we find in other alphabetic poems also, especially the older ones, many deviations from the rule, which undeniably prove that the composers bound themselves rigorously by the order of the alphabet only so long as it fitted in to the course of thought without any artificiality. Thus, for instance, in Ps. cxlv. the *Nun* verse is wanting; in Ps. xxxiv. the *Vav* verse; while, at the close, after **נ**, there follows another verse with **ד**. Just such another closing verse is found in Ps. xxv., in which, besides, the first two verses begin with **נ**; while **כ** is wanting; two verses, moreover, begin with **נ** instead of **פ** and **ר**: in Ps. xxxvii. **י** is replaced by **ש**, which is again found after **ד** in its proper order. It is also to be considered that, in many of these poems, the division of the verses into strophes is not continuously and regularly carried out; e.g. in these same Lamentations, i. 7 and ii. 19, verses of four lines occur among those with three. Attempts have, indeed, been made to attribute these irregularities to later revisers, who mistook the arrangement

into strophes; but the arguments adduced will not stand the test; see details in Hävernick's *Einl.* iii. S. 51 ff.

If we gather all these elements together, we shall be obliged to seek for the reason of most, if not all of these deviations from the norm, in the free use made of such forms by the Hebrew poets. Gerlach here objects that, "in view of the loose connection of thought in alphabetic poems generally, and in these Lamentations particularly, and considering the evident dexterity with which the poet elsewhere uses the form, another arrangement of the series would not have caused him any difficulty." We reply that there is no want in these poems of a careful arrangement of thought; but that the skill of the poet, in making use of this arrangement, was not always sufficient to let him put his thoughts, corresponding to things, into the alphabetic form, without using artificial means or forced constructions; and that, in such cases, the form was rather sacrificed to the thought, than rigorously maintained through the adoption of forced and unnatural forms of expression.

Finally, the reason for the absence of the alphabetic arrangement from the fifth poem is simply, that the lamentation there resolves itself into a prayer, in which the careful consideration indispensable for the carrying out of the alphabetic arrangement must give place to the free and natural outcome of the feelings.

§ 2. THE AUTHOR, TIME OF COMPOSITION, AND POSITION IN THE CANON.

AUTHOR.—In the Hebrew text no one is named as the author of the Lamentations; but an old tradition affirms that the prophet Jeremiah composed them. Even so early as in the Alexandrine version, we find prefixed to i. 1, the words, *Kai ἐγένετο μετὰ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐρημωθῆναι, ἐκάθισεν Ἱερεμίας κλαίων, καὶ ἐθρήνησε τὸν θρῆνον τοῦτον ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, καὶ εἶπε.* These words are also found in the Vulgate; only, instead of *et dixit*, there is the amplification, *et amaro animo suspirans et ejulans dixit.* The Syriac is without this notice; but the Arabic exactly reproduces the words of the LXX., and the Targum begins with the words, *Dixit Jeremias*

propheta et sacerdos magnus. After this, both in the Talmud (*Baba bathr.* f. 15. 1) and by the Church Fathers (Origen in *Euseb. hist. eccl.* iv. 25, Jerome in *prolog. gal.*, etc.), as well as the later theologians, the Jeremianic authorship was assumed as certain. The learned but eccentric Hermann von der Hardt was the first to call in question the Jeremianic composition of the book, in a “Programm” published in 1712 at Helmstädt; he attributed the five poems to Daniel, Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego, and King Jehoiachin (!). This doubt was resumed at a later period by an unknown writer in the *Tübingen Theol. Quartalschr.* 1819, part i.; it was mentioned by Augusti (*Einl.*), and further carried out by Conz in *Bengel's Archiv*, iv. p. 161 f. and 422 ff. Kalkar was the next to question the traditional belief, and urged against it the position of the book among the בְּתַבִּים, and the difference existing between the Greek translation of the Lamentations and that of the prophecies of Jeremiah; these objections he held to be not inconsiderable, yet not decisive. Then Ewald (*Poet. Bücher des A. B.* i. S. 145, and in the third edition of the same book, i. 2, S. 326; cf. *Bibl. Jahrb.* vii. S. 151 f., and *History of the People of Israel*, iv. p. 22) decidedly refused to ascribe the book to the prophet, and rather attributed it to one of his pupils, Baruch or some other; in this opinion he is followed by Bunsen, as is usual in questions regarding the criticism of the Old Testament. Finally, Nägelsbach (in Lange's series, see Clark's *For. Theol. Lib.*), with the help of the Concordance, has prepared a table of those words and forms of words found in the Lamentations, but not occurring in the prophecies of Jeremiah; by this means he has endeavoured to set forth the difference of language in the two books, which he accepts as a decisive reason for rejecting the Jeremianic authorship of the Lamentations. And Thenius assures us that, “in consequence of pretty long and conscientious examination, he has become convinced” that chap. ii. and iv., judging from their contents and form, undeniably proceeded from Jeremiah; while chap. i. and iii. were composed by one who was left behind in the country, some time after the destruction of Jerusalem, and shortly before the last deportation; but chap. v. is from a man “who was probably wandering about everywhere, as the *leader* of a band of nobles

seeking a safe asylum, but unwilling to attach themselves to the caravan going to Egypt."

Schrader, in his late revision of De Wette's *Introduction*, § 339, has thus condensed the results of these critical investigations: In support of the old tradition, which mentions Jeremiah as the author, "one might appeal to the affinity in contents, spirit, tone, and language (De W.)." Nevertheless, this same style of language, and the mode of representation, exhibit, again, so much that is peculiar; the artificiality of form, especially in chap. i., ii., and iv., is so unlike Jeremiah's style; the absence of certain specific Jeremianic peculiarities, and the contradiction between some expressions of the prophet and those of the author of the *Lamentations*, is again so striking, that one must characterize the authorship of Jeremiah as very improbable, if not quite impossible, especially since the points of likeness to the language used by Jeremiah, on the one hand, are sufficiently accounted for in general by the fact that both works were composed at the same time; and on the other hand, are nullified by other points of likeness to Ezekiel's style, which show that use has already been made of his prophecies." Again: "The hypothesis of Thenius, that the poems are by different authors, is refuted by the similarity in the fundamental character of the poems, and in the character of the language." We may therefore dispense with a special refutation of this hypothesis, especially since it will be shown in the exposition that the points which Thenius has brought forward in support of his view are all founded on a wretchedly prosaic style of interpretation, which fails to recognise the true nature of poetry, and regards mere poetic figures as actual history. Of the considerations, however, which Schrader has adduced against the Jeremianic authorship, the last two that are mentioned would, of course, have decided influence, if there were any real foundation for them, viz. the contradiction between some expressions of Jeremiah and those of the author of the *Lamentations*. But they have no foundation in fact.

The only instance of a contradiction is said to exist between v. 7 and Jer. xxxi. 29, 30. It is quoted by Schrader, who refers to Nöldeke, *die alttest. Literat.* S. 146. But the expression, "Our fathers have sinned, they are no more, we bear their

iniquities" (v. 7), does not stand in contradiction to what is said in Jer. xxxix. 29 f. against the current proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth have become blunt," viz. that in the future, after the restoration of Israel, "every one shall die for his own iniquity, and the teeth of every one who eats sour grapes shall become blunt." One statement would contradict the other only if the latter meant that those who bear the punishment were guiltless, or thought themselves such. But how far this thought was from the mind of the suppliant in v. 7, is shown by what he says in ver. 16: "Woe unto us, for we have sinned." According to these words, those in ver. 7 can only mean, "We atone not merely for our own sins, but also the sins of our fathers," or, "The sins of our fathers as well as our own are visited on us." This confession accords with Scripture (cf. Ex. xx. 5, Jer. xvi. 11, etc.), and is radically different from the proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes," etc., which was constantly in the mouth of those who considered themselves innocent, and who thereby perverted the great truth, that God visits the sins of the fathers upon the children who hate Him, into the false statement, that innocent children must atone for the sins of their fathers. On this, cf. also the exposition of v. 7. But when Schrader, following Nöldeke, further remarks, "that Jeremiah would hardly have said nothing whatever about God's having foretold all this suffering *through him*," there lies at the foundation of this remark the preposterous notion, that Jeremiah ought to have brought himself prominently forward in the Lamentations (supposing him to have written them), as one who ought not to suffer the evil under which the people were groaning. Such gross Pelagianism was foreign to the prophet Jeremiah. No one need speak, therefore, of a contradiction between the Lamentations and the prophecies of Jeremiah.

As little proof is there for the assertion that the author of the Lamentations made use of the prophecies of Ezekiel. Nägelsbach and Schrader, in support of this allegation, have adduced only ii. 14, compared with Ezek. xii. 24, xiii. 5 f.; and ii. 15, compared with Ezek. xxvii. 3, xxviii. 12. Nägelsbach says: "The words, וְתַּפְלֵל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל דְּבָרָךְ שָׁוֹא וְתַּפְלֵל, in ii. 14, are no doubt a quotation from Ezek. xii. 24, xiii. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15,

23, xxi. 28, 34, xxii. 28. For it is only in these passages, and nowhere else in the Old Testament, that the expression **חַזָּה שְׂאֵל** occurs, and in combination with **תְּפִלָּה**. Moreover, **בְּלִילָה יְפִי**, in ii. 15, is an expression decidedly peculiar to Ezekiel, for it occurs only in Ezek. xxvii. 3 (cf. xxviii. 12), and nowhere else." But the three expressions of these two passages form really too weak a proof that the author of the Lamentations made use of the prophecies of Ezekiel. Of course, as regards the mere form of the words, it is true that the expression **בְּלִילָה יְפִי**, "she who is perfect in beauty," is found, besides Lam. ii. 15, only in Ezek. xxvii. 3, where the prophet says of Tyre, "Thou sayest, I am perfect in beauty," and in Ezek. xxviii. 12, where it is said of the king of Tyre, "Thou art . . . **בְּלִילָה יְפִי**;" but the thing occurs also in Ps. l. 2, with the unimportant change in the form of the words **מְכָלָל יְפִי**, "perfection of beauty," where Zion is so designated. Now, if we not merely gather out of the Concordance the expressions of like import, but also keep in view the idea presented in ii. 15, "Is this the city **שְׁאֵלָה** **בְּלִילָה אֶרְזָה**?" and at the same time consider that the poet says this of Jerusalem, there cannot be the least doubt that he did not take these epithets, which are applied to Jerusalem, from Ezekiel, who used them to designate Tyre, but that he had Ps. l. 2 in view, just as the other epithet, "a joy of the whole earth," points to Ps. xlvi. 3. Only on the basis of these passages in the Psalms could he employ the expression **שְׁאֵלָה**, "which they call." Or are we to believe that the word **בְּלִילָה**, **בְּלִילָה** was originally unknown to the author of the Lamentations, and that he first became acquainted with it through Ezekiel? Nor, again, can we say that the words taken by Nägelsbach out of ii. 14 are "undoubtedly a quotation from Ezekiel," because they do not occur in this way in any of the passages cited from Ezekiel. All that we can find on this assertion is, that in the prophecies of Jeremiah neither **חַזָּה שְׂאֵל** nor the word-form **תְּפִלָּה** occurs; while Ezekiel not only uses **חַזָּה שְׂאֵל**, xii. 14, and **מְחַזֵּה שְׂאֵל**, xiii. 9–11, "They build a wall, and plaster it over with lime" (cf. xiii. 10, cf. vers. 14, 15, 18). These same false prophets are also called, in ver. 11, **תְּחִזִּים אֶת־תְּפִלָּה**, "those who plaster with lime." But Ezekiel uses the word **תְּפִלָּה** only in

the meaning of “lime,” while the writer of these Lamentations employs it in the metaphorical sense, “absurdity, nonsense,” in the same way as Jeremiah, xxiii. 13, uses חָפֶלֶת, “absurdity,” of the prophets of Samaria. Now, just as Jeremiah has not taken חָפֶלֶת from Ezekiel, where it does not occur at all (but only in Job i. 22, xxiv. 12), so there is as little likelihood in the opinion that the word חָפֶלֶת, in Lam. ii. 14, has been derived from Ezekiel, because Job vi. 6 shows that it was far from rarely used by the Hebrews. Nor does the non-occurrence of שׁוֹאָה חָזָה in Jeremiah afford any tenable ground for the opinion that the expression, as found in Lam. ii. 14, was taken from Ezekiel. The idea contained in חָזָה was not unknown to Jeremiah; for he speaks, xiv. 14, of שָׁקָר חָזָה, and in xxiii. 16 of מְלֵבָם חָזָה, referring to the false prophets, whose doings he characterizes as שָׁקָר; cf. vi. 13, viii. 10, xiv. 14, xxiii. 25 f., 32, xxvii. 10, 15, xxviii. 16, xxix. 9, 23, 31. Further, if we consult only the text of the Bible instead of the Concordance, and ponder the connection of thought in the separate passages, we can easily perceive why, instead of שָׁקָר (חָזָה), which is so frequent in Jeremiah, there is found in Lam. ii. 14, שָׁאָה and שָׁאָה מְשֻׁאָה חָזָה. In the addresses in which Jeremiah warns the people of the lying conduct of the false prophets, who spoke merely out of their own heart, שָׁקָר was the most suitable expression; in Lam. ii. 14, on the contrary, where complaint is made that the prophecies of their prophets afford no comfort to the people in their present distress, שָׁאָה was certainly the most appropriate word which the composer could select, even without a knowledge of Ezekiel. There can be no question, then, regarding a quotation from that prophet. But even though it were allowed that ii. 14 implied an actual acquaintance with chap. xii. and xiii. of Ezekiel, still, nothing would follow from that against the Jeremianic authorship of the Lamentations. For Jeremiah uttered these prophecies in the sixth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, *i.e.* in the third year before the last siege, and the fifth before the destruction of Jerusalem; and considering the frequent intercourse carried on between the captives in Babylon and those who still remained in Judah and Jerusalem, in virtue of which the former even sent letters to Jerusalem (cf. Jer. xxix. 25), some of Ezekiel’s prophecies might have become known in

the latter city a considerable time before the final catastrophe, and even reached the ears of Jeremiah.

With the demolition of these two arguments, the main strength of our opponents, in the bringing forward of proof, has been broken. Schrader has not adduced a single instance showing "the absence of certain specific Jeremianic peculiarities." For "the comparatively less emphasis given to the sins of the people," which is alleged in Nöldeke's note, cannot be applied in support of that position, even if it were correct, in view of the prominence so frequently assigned to grievous sin, i. 5, 8, 14, 18, 22, ii. 14, iii. 39, 42, iv. 6, 13, v. 7; because the Lamentations were not composed with the design of punishing the people for their sin, but were intended to comfort in their misery, and to raise up again, the people who had been severely chastised for the guilt of their sin, which was greater than the sin of Sodom (iv. 6). Add to this, that Schrader, by using this argument, contradicts himself; for he has shortly before adduced the affinity in contents, spirit, tone, and language as an argument to which one might appeal in support of the Jeremianic authorship, and this affinity he has established by a long series of quotations.¹

Further, the remark that "the artificiality of form, especially in chap. i., ii., and iv., is unlike Jeremiah," is correct only in so far as no alphabetic poems are to be found in the prophetic book of Jeremiah. But are we then to look for poetic compositions in prophetic addresses and historical narratives? The remark now quoted is based on the assertion made by other critics, that the alphabetic arrangement of poetic compositions generally is a mere rhetorical work of art, and the production of a later but degenerate taste (Ed. Reuss and others), or a piece of

¹ The passages are the following: i. 8 f., cf. with Jer. iv. 30, xiii. 21 f., 26; i. 20, iv. 13 ff., with Jer. xiv. 7, 18; ii. 14 with Jer. xiv. 13; i. 16, ii. 11, iii. 48, 49, with Jer. viii. 21 ff., ix. 16 ff., xiii. 17, xiv. 17; iii. 52 with Jer. xv. 26 f.; chap. iii. with Jer. xv. 10 ff., xvii. 5 ff., 14 ff., xx. 7 ff., 14 ff. (De Wette). Further, בְּתִלְתָּחַת בְּעֵמִי, i. 15, ii. 13, cf. Jer. xiv. 17, xlvi. 11; מְחֻמְרִים מְגֻנָּר, ii. 22, cf. Jer. iv. 25, x. 3, 10; לְלִילִי, i. 11, cf. Jer. xv. 19; instead of נְדָה, i. 8; לְאָוֹ instead of מְחֻמְרִים, i. 11; שְׂוִימְמִין אֲכָלְלָה, iv. 5; נְאָלָה, iv. 14; Finally, Chaldaizing forms: יְשָׁנָא, i. 4; שְׁרָגָן, iv. 1; הַעֲבָרָא, iii. 12; מְטָרָא, ii. 1; יְשָׁנָא, i. 14.

trifling unworthy of the prophet. This view has long ago been shown groundless; cf. Hävernick's *Einl.* iii. S. 46 ff. Even Hupfeld, who calls the alphabetical arrangement "artificiality or trifling," considers that it is of a kindred nature with collections of proverbs, and with small poems of a didactic character but deficient in close connection of thought; he thinks, too, that it may be comparatively ancient as a style of composition, and that it was not applied till later to other species of writing (as Lamentations). To this, Ed. Riehm, in the second edition of Hupfeld on the Psalms, i. p. 31, has added a very true remark: "In lyric poetry proper, the employment of this artificial form is naturally and intrinsically justified only when a single fundamental strain, that fills the whole soul of the poet,—deep, strong, and sustained,—seeks to die away in many different forms of chords; hence its employment in the elegy." The application of this artificial form to such a purpose is perfectly justified in these Lamentations; and the attempt to deny that these poems are the work of Jeremiah, on the ground of their artificial construction, would be as great an exhibition of arbitrary conduct, as if any one refused to ascribe the hymn "Befiehl du deine Wege" to Paul Gerhardt, or "Wie schön leucht' uns der Morgenstern" to Philip Nicolai, on the ground of the "artificiality" that manifests itself in the beginning of the verses.

Finally, the language and the mode of representation in these poems certainly exhibit much that is peculiar; and we find in them many words, word-forms, and modes of expression, which do not occur in the prophecies of Jeremiah. But it must also be borne in mind that the Lamentations are not prophetic addresses intended to warn, rebuke, and comfort, but lyric poetry, which has its own proper style of language, and this different from prophetic address. Both the subject-matter and the poetic form of these poems, smooth though this is in general, necessarily resulted in this,—that through the prevalence of peculiar thoughts, modes of representation, and feelings, the language also received an impress, in words and modes of expression, that was peculiar to itself, and different from the prophetic diction of Jeremiah. The mere collection of the words, word-forms, and expressions peculiar to the Lamentations, and not occurring in the prophecies of Jeremiah,

cannot furnish irrefragable proof that the authors of the two writings were different, unless it be shown, at the same time, that the character of the language in both writings is essentially different, and that for the ideas, modes of representation, and thoughts common to both, other words and expressions are used in the Lamentations than those found in the prophecies of Jeremiah. But neither the one nor the other has been made out by Nägelsbach. After giving the long list he has prepared, which occupies five and a half columns, and which gives the words occurring in the different verses of the five chapters, he explains that he does not seek to lay any weight on the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, probably because Jeremiah also has many such words; but then he raises the question, "How is the fact to be accounted for, that Jeremiah never uses עליון or אָלֵין except as divine names, while the latter, nevertheless, occurs fourteen times in the Lamentations; that Jeremiah never uses יְהוָה, אָנֹכִי, נָחַת, נָשָׂא פְנִים, עַפְרָה, חַזְקָה, חַשְׁמָר, חַטָּא, the relative שׁ, or בְּקָרְבָן without a suffix, while all these expressions occur more or less frequently in the Lamentations? And it has been well remarked that these expressions are not of so specific a kind, that the fact of their not being used in the prophetic book, but employed in the Lamentations, might be explained from the nature of the contents; but they belong, in great measure, to what I may call the house-dress of the author, which he constantly wears,—which he more or less unconsciously and unintentionally uses." We answer that the simile of the house-dress has been most unhappily chosen. Although the style of a writer may possibly be compared to his coat, yet nobody is in the habit of wearing his house-coat always, on Sundays and week-days, in the house and out of it; so, too, no writer is in the habit of using always the same words in prose and poetry. When we investigate the matter itself, we find we must, first of all, deduct fully one-third of the words enumerated, although these have evidently been collected and arranged as the most convincing proof; the words thus rejected are also found in the prophetic book of Jeremiah, though not quite in the same grammatical form, as the note shows.¹ Then

¹ For בְּקָרְבָן, without a suffix, iii. 45, exactly corresponds to מִקְרָב, Jer.

we ask the counter question, whether words which one who composed five poems employs only in one of these pieces, or only once or twice throughout the whole, ought to be reckoned as his house-dress? Of the words adduced, we do not find a single one in all the five poems, but חַשְׁךְ only in iii. 2, נְשָׁא פְנִים only in iv. 16, נְגִינָה only in iii. 14 and v. 14, פְחָה only in ii. 16 and iii. 46, עַלְיוֹן only in iii. 35 and 38, אַנְחָה (Niphal) only in chap. i. (four times). Moreover, we ask whether Jeremiah might not also, in lyric poems, use poetic words which could not be employed in homely address? But of the words enumerated, לְמַן, עַלְיוֹן, and אַרְנִי alone as a name of God, together with נְגִינָה, belong to the poetic style.¹ They are therefore not found in Jeremiah, simply because his prophetic addresses are neither lyric poems, nor rise to the lyric height of prophetic address. The rest of the words mentioned are also found in the Psalms especially, and in Job, as will be shown in the detailed exposition. And when we go deeper into the matter, we find that, in the Lamentations, there is the same tendency to reproduce the thoughts and language of the Psalms vi. 1: cf. besides, בְּקָרְבָּה, iv. 15, 20, with Jer. xxiii. 9; בְּקָרְבָּה, iv. 13, and Jer. vi. 6, xlvi. 21. אָחָמֵל, ii. 2, 17, 21, iii. 43, is found five times in Jeremiah (xiii. 14, xv. 5, xxi. 7, l. 14, li. 3), not only in the 3d pers. perfect, but also in the imperfect. Of עַלְעַל there occurs the Kal, Jer. li. 34, and the noun בְּלֹעַ, li. 44; from חַשְׁךְ, the noun חַשְׁךְ certainly is not found, but perhaps the verb is used in the Hiphil, Jer. xiii. 16, as the Kal in Lam. iv. 8, v. 16. With אַתְּחָת, i. 8 and iii. 39, alternates אַתְּחָתָה, iv. 6, 22, which Jeremiah frequently uses. Of שְׁמָמָה, the participle שְׁמָמָה certainly is not found in Jeremiah, but the adj. שְׁמָמָה is found in Jer. xii. 11, as in Lam. v. 8; and the Niphal of the verb in Jer. iv. 9 and xxxiii. 10, as in Lam. iv. 5. Lastly, neither is עַנְהָה wholly wanting in Jeremiah; for in xxii. 16 we are to read עַנְיָה, miser, although the noun עַנְיָה and the verb are not met with in his book.

¹ עַלְיוֹן as a name of God (iii. 35 and 38), besides Isa. xiv. 14, is found only in poetic pieces, Num. xxvi. 16, Deut. xxxii. 8, and about twenty times in the Psalms; אַרְנִי used by itself, except in direct addresses to God and interviews with Him, occurs in the Psalms about forty times, and also in the addresses of particular prophets, composed in the loftier style, particularly Isaiah and Amos; lastly, נְגִינָה, in iii. 14, occurs as a reminiscence of Job xxx. 9, and in the Psalms and hymns, Isa. xxxviii. 20, and Hab. iii. 10.

(especially those describing the psalmist's sufferings) and of the book of Job, that characterizes the prophecies of Jeremiah, in the use he makes of Deuteronomy and the writings of earlier prophets. Another peculiarity of Jeremiah's style is seen in the fact that the composer of the Lamentations, like Jeremiah in his addresses, repeats himself much, not merely in his ideas, but also in his words: *e.g.*, לֹא חִטָּל occurs four times, of which three instances are in chap. ii. (vers. 2, 17, 21) and one in iii. 43; מִתְחַטֵּל (and מִתְחַטָּר) also occurs four times (i. 7, 10, 11, ii. 4), and נִנְחָה as frequently (i. 4, 8, 11, 21); יְמִין is found five times (i. 4, 5, 12, iii. 32, 33), but in all the other Old Testament writings only thrice; and Jeremiah also uses יְמִין four times, while, of all the other prophets, Isaiah is the only one who employs it, and this he does twice.

These marks may be sufficient of themselves to show unmistakeably that the peculiarity of the prophet as an author is also found in the Lamentations, and that nothing can be discovered showing a difference of language in the expression of thoughts common to both writings. But this will be still more evident if we consider, finally, the similarity, both as regards the subjects of thought and the style of expression, exhibited in a considerable number of instances in which certain expressions characteristic of Jeremiah are also found in Lamentations: *e.g.*, the frequent employment of שָׁבֵר and בַּת עַמִּי, ii. 11, 13, iii. 47, 48, iv. 10, cf. with Jer. iv. 6, 20, vi. 1, 14, viii. 11, 21, x. 19, xiv. 17, etc.; מְנֻור מִפְּבִיב, ii. 22, with מְנֻור, Jer. vi. 25, xx. 3, 10, xlvi. 5, xlix. 29; or, מִים, עַז יְרָדָה לְמַעַת, i. 16, ii. 18, iii. 48, ii. 11, cf. with Jer. viii. 23, ix. 17, xiii. 17, xiv. 17; חִיִּתִי שְׁתָק, iii. 14, with חִיִּתִי לְשָׁתָק, Jer. xx. 7; פָּתָח, iii. 47, as in Jer. xlvi. 43. Cf. also the note on p. 345, after the passages quoted by De Wette. Pareau, then, had good reason when, long ago, he pointed out the peculiarities of Jeremiah in the style of the Lamentations; and only a superficial criticism can assert against this, that the existing coincidences find a sufficient explanation in the assumption that, speaking generally, the two books were composed at the same period.¹ We therefore close this investigation, after having

¹ Pareau has discussed this question very well in the *Observatt. general.*, prefixed to his *Commentary*, § 6-8, and concludes with this result: *Non*

proved that the tradition which ascribes the Lamentations to the prophet Jeremiah as their author is as well-founded as any ancient historical tradition whatever.

TIME OF COMPOSITION.—From the organic connection of the five poems, as shown above, it follows of itself that they cannot have proceeded from different authors, nor originated at different periods, but were composed at brief intervals, one after the other, not long after the destruction of Jerusalem and the fall of the kingdom of Judah, and in the order in which they have been transmitted to us. What gives special support to this conclusion is the circumstance that, throughout these Lamentations, there is no possibility of mistaking the expression of grief, still fresh in the writer's mind, over the horrors of that fearful catastrophe. The assumption, however, that the prophet, in the picture he draws, had before his eyes the ruins of the city, and the misery of those who had been left behind, cannot be certainly made out from a consideration of the contents of the poems. But there seems to be no doubt that Jeremiah composed them in the interval between the destruction of Jerusalem and his involuntary departure to Egypt. There is no tenable ground for the confident assertion of Ewald, that they were composed in Egypt; for the passages, i. 3, iv. 18 f., v. 5, 9, do not mean that the writer was then living among the fugitives who had fled in such vast multitudes to Egypt, partly before and partly after the destruction of the city.

POSITION OF THE LAMENTATIONS IN THE CANON.—The separation of the Lamentations from the book of the prophecies of Jeremiah, and their reception into the third division of the Old Testament canon (the *Kethubim*),—which Kalkschmidt and Thenius, in complete misunderstanding of the principle on which the tripartition of the canon is founded, would bring to bear as an argument against their having been composed by Jeremiah,—are

tantum regnant in Threnis variis illi characteres, quos stilo Jeremiæ proprios esse vidimus, verum etiam manifesto cernitur in eorum scriptore animus tener, lenis, ad queavis tristia facile commotus ac dolorem ægre ferens. Quod autem in iis frequentius observetur, quam in sermonibus Jeremiæ propheticis, dictionis sublimitas et brevitas majorque imaginum copia et pulchritudo, atque conceputum vis et intentio: illud vix aliter fieri potuisse agnoscemus, si ad argumenti naturam attendamus, quo rehementur affici debuerit Jeremias; etc., p. 40.

fully accounted for by their subjective, lyric contents; in consequence of this they differ essentially from the prophecies, and take their place alongside of the Psalms and other productions of sacred poesy. This position of theirs among the *Kethubim* must be considered (against Bleek) as the original one; their arrangement by the side of the prophetic writings of Jeremiah in the LXX. and Vulgate, which Luther [as well as the translators of the "authorized" English version] has retained, must have originated with the Alexandrine translators, who could not understand the arrangement of the Hebrew canon, and who afterwards, in order to make the number of the books of the Bible the same as that of the letters of the alphabet (twenty-two), counted the Lamentations as forming one book with the prophecies of Jeremiah. That this arrangement and enumeration of the Lamentations, observed by the Hellenists, deviated from the tradition of the Jews of Palestine, may be perceived from the remark of Jerome, in his *Prol. galeat.*, regarding this mode of reckoning: *quamquam nonnulli Ruth et Cynoth inter hagiographa scriptitent, et hos libros in suo putent numero suppundos.* Their arrangement in the series of the five *Megilloth* (rolls appointed to be read on certain annual feast-days and memorial-days) in our editions of the Hebrew Bible was not fixed till a later period, when, according to the ordinance in the synagogal liturgy, the Lamentations were appointed to be read on the ninth of the month Ab, as the anniversary of the destruction of the temples of Solomon and of Herod. [Cf. Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* xv. 310.]

The importance of the Lamentations, as a part of the canon, does not so much consist in the mere fact that they were composed by Jeremiah, and contain outpourings of sorrow on different occasions over the misery of his people, as rather in their being an evidence of the interest with which Jeremiah, in the discharge of his functions as a prophet, continued to watch over the ruins of Jerusalem. In these Lamentations he seeks not merely to give expression to the sorrow of the people that he may weep with them, but by his outpour of complaint to rouse his fellow-countrymen to an acknowledgment of God's justice in this visitation, to keep them from despair under the burden of unutterable woe, and by teaching them how to give

due submission to the judgment that has befallen them, to lead once more to God those who would not let themselves be brought to Him through his previous testimony regarding that judgment while it was yet impending. The Jewish synagogue has recognised and duly estimated the importance of the Lamentations in these respects, by appointing that the book should be read on the anniversary of the destruction of the temple. A like appreciation has been made by the Christian Church, which, rightly perceiving that the Israelitish community is the subject in these poems, attributed to them a reference to the church militant; and, viewing the judgment on the people of God as a prophecy of the judgment that came on Him who took the sins of the whole world upon Himself, it has received a portion of the Lamentations into the ritual for the Passion Week, and concludes each of these lessons with the words, "*Jerusalem, Jerusalem, convertere ad Dominum, Deum tuum.*" Cf. *The Passion Week in its Ceremonies and Prayers*, Spires 1856, and the *Officium hebdomadæ sanctæ*, a reprinted extract from Dr. Reischl's *Passionale*, München 1857. The motives for this choice are so far set forth by Allioli (in Neumann, ii. S. 486) in the following terms: "The church wished believers to see, in the great punishments which God had ordained against Jerusalem by the instrumentality of Nebuchadnezzar, the still more severe chastisement that God has brought on Israel after the dreadful murder of the Messias. She seeks to bewail the unhappy condition of the blinded nation, once favoured with the divine revelation. In the fall of Jerusalem, she seeks to deplore the evil that has come on herself from external and internal foes, the persecution of brother by brother, the havoc made by false teachers, the looseness of opinions, the sad advances made by indifference in matters of faith and by the corruption of morals. In the devastation and the penalties inflicted on Jersusalem, she wishes to present for consideration the destruction which comes on every soul that dies the death in sins. In the condition of the ruined city and the homeless nation, she seeks to make men bewail the homeless condition of the whole race, who have fallen into decay and disorder through Adam's sin. And lastly, in the nation visited with punishment, she seeks to set forth Jesus Christ Himself,

in so far as He has become the substitute of all men, and suffered for their sins." This display of all these references is sadly deficient in logical arrangement; but it contains a precious kernel of biblical truth, which the Evangelical Church¹ has endeavoured in many ways to turn to advantage. Regarding the adaptations of the Lamentations made for liturgical use in the Evangelical Church, see particulars in Schöberlein, *Schatz des liturgischen Chor- und Gemeindegesanges*, ii. S. 444 ff.

As to the commentaries on the Lamentations, see Keil's *Manual of Introduction to the Old Testament*, vol. i. p. 508 [Clark's Foreign Theol. Library]. To the list of works therein given are to be appended, as later productions, Ewald's recent treatment of the book in the third edition of the *Dichter des A. Bundes* (1866), i. 2, where the Lamentations have been inserted among the Psalms, S. 321 ff.; Wilh. Engelhardt, *die Klagel. Jerem. übersetzt*. 1867; Ernst Gerlach, *die Klagel. erkl.* 1868; and Nägelsbach, in Lange's series of commentaries (Clark's English edition), 1868.

¹ i.e. the "United Evangelical Church" of Germany, the National Protestant Church, which was formed by the coalition of the Lutheran and Reformed (or Calvinistic) communions. This union began in Prussia in 1817, and was gradually effected in other German states. But many staunch adherents of the old distinctive (Augsburg and Helvetic) Confessions endured persecution rather than consent to enter the "United" Church. The liturgy was framed under the special direction of the Prussian king in 1821, and after some alterations were made on it, appointed by a royal decree, in 1830, to be used in all the churches.—TR.

EXPOSITION.

CHAP. I.—SORROW AND WAILING OVER THE FALL OF JERUSALEM AND JUDAH.

1. 'Alas ! how she sits alone, the city [that was] full of people !
She has become like a widow, [that was] great among the nations ;
The princess among provinces has become a vassal.
- 2 She weeps bitterly through the night, and her tears are upon her cheek ;
She has no comforter out of all her lovers :
All her friends have deceived her ; they have become enemies to her.
- 3 Judah is taken captive out of affliction, and out of much servitude ;
She sitteth among the nations, she hath found no rest ;
All those who pursued her overtook her in the midst of her distresses.
- 4 The ways of Zion mourn, for want of those who went up to the appointed feast ;
All her gates are waste ; her priests sigh ;
Her virgins are sad, and she herself is in bitterness.
- 5 Her enemies have become supreme ; those who hate her are at ease ;
For Jahveh hath afflicted her because of the multitude of her transgressions :
Her young children have gone into captivity before the oppressor.
- 6 And from the daughter of Zion all her honour has departed ;
Her princes have become like harts [that] have found no pasture,
And have gone without strength before the pursuer.

¹ Keil has attempted, in his German translation of this and the next three chapters, to reproduce something of the alphabetic acrosticism of the original (see above, p. 337) ; but he has frequently been compelled, in consequence, to give something else than a faithful reproduction of the Hebrew. It will be observed that his example has not been followed here ; but his peculiar renderings have generally been given, except where these peculiarities were evidently caused by the self-imposed restraint now mentioned. He himself confesses, in two passages omitted from the present translation (pp. 591 and 600 of the German original), that for the sake of reproducing the alphabeticism, he has been forced to deviate from a strict translation of the ideas presented in the Hebrew.—Tr.

7 In the days of her affliction and her persecutions,
 Jerusalem remembers all her pleasant things which have been from the
 days of old :
 When her people fell by the hand of the oppressor, and there was none
 to help her,
 Her oppressors saw her,—they laughed at her times of rest.

8 Jerusalem hath sinned grievously, therefore she hath become an abomi-
 nation :
 All those who honoured her despise her, because they have seen her
 nakedness ;
 And she herself sighs, and turns backward.

9 Her filth is on her flowing skirts ; she remembered not her latter end ;
 And so she sank wonderfully : she has no comforter.
 “ O Jahveh, behold my misery ! ” for the enemy hath boasted.

10 The oppressor hath spread out his hand upon all her precious things ;
 For she hath seen [how] the heathen have come into her sanctuary,
 [Concerning] whom Thou didst command that they should not enter
 into Thy community.

11 All her people [have been] sighing, seeking bread ;
 They have given their precious things for bread, to revive their soul.
 See, O Jahveh, and consider that I am become despised.

12 [Is it] nothing to you, all ye that pass along the way ?
 Consider, and see if there be sorrow like my sorrow which is done to me,
 Whom Jahveh hath afflicted in the day of the burning of His anger.

13 From above He sent fire in my bones, so that it mastered them ;
 He hath spread a net for my feet, He hath turned me back ;
 He hath made me desolate and ever languishing.

14 The yoke of my transgressions hath been fastened to by His hand ;
 They have interwoven themselves, they have come up on my neck ; it
 hath made my strength fail :
 The Lord hath put me into the hands of [those against whom] I cannot
 rise up.

15 The Lord hath removed all my strong ones in my midst ;
 He hath proclaimed a festival against me, to break my young men in
 pieces :
 The Lord hath trodden the wine-press for the virgin daughter of Judah.

16 Because of these things I weep ; my eye, my eye runneth down [with]
 water,
 Because a comforter is far from me, one to refresh my soul ;
 My children are destroyed, because the enemy hath prevailed.

17 Zion stretcheth forth her hands, [yet] there is none to comfort her ;
 Jahveh hath commanded concerning Jacob ; his oppressors are round
 about him :
 Jerusalem hath become an abomination among them.

18 Jahveh is righteous, for I have rebelled against His mouth.
 Hear now, all ye peoples, and behold my sorrow ;
 My virgins an' my young men are gone into captivity.

19 I called for my lovers, [but] they have deceived me ;
 My priests and my elders expired in the city,
 When they were seeking bread for themselves, that they might revive
 their spirit.

20 Behold, O Jahveh, how distressed I am ! my bowels are moved ;
 My heart is turned within me, for I was very rebellious :
 Without, the sword bereaveth [me] ; within, [it is] like death.

21 They have heard that I sigh, I have no comforter :
 All mine enemies have heard of my trouble ; they are glad because Thou
 hast done it.
 Thou bringest the day [that] Thou hast proclaimed, that they may be
 like me.

22 Let all their wickedness come before Thee,
 And do to them as Thou hast done to me because of all my trans-
 gressions ;
 For my sighs are many and my heart is faint.

The poem begins with a doleful meditation on the deeply degraded state into which Jerusalem has fallen ; and in the first half (vers. 1-11), lament is made over the sad condition of the unhappy city, which, forsaken by all her friends, and persecuted by enemies, has lost all her glory, and, finding no comforter in her misery, pines in want and disesteem. In the second half (vers. 12-22), the city herself is introduced, weeping, and giving expression to her sorrow over the evil determined against her because of her sins. Both portions are closely connected. On the one hand, we find, even in vers. 9 and 11, tones of lamentation, like sighs from the city, coming into the description of her misery, and preparing the way for the introduction of her lamentation in vers. 12-22 ; on the other hand, her sin is mentioned even so early as in vers. 5 and 8 as the cause of her misfortune, and the transition thus indicated from complaint to the confession of guilt found in the second part. This transition is made in ver. 17 by means of a kind of meditation on the cheerless and helpless condition of the city. The second half of the poem is thereby divided into two equal portions, and in such a manner that, while in the former of these (vers. 12-16) it is complaint that prevails, and the thought of guilt comes forward only in ver. 14, in the latter (vers. 18-22) the confession of God's justice and of sin in the speaker becomes most prominent ; and the repeated mention of misery and oppression rises into an entreaty for deliverance from the misery,

and the hope that the Lord will requite all evil on the enemy.

Vers. 1-11. Doleful consideration and description of the dis-honour that has befallen Jerusalem. In these verses the prophet, in the name of the godly, pours out his heart before the Lord. The dreadful turn that things have taken is briefly declared in ver. 1 in two clauses, which set forth the fall of Jerusalem from its former glory into the depths of disgrace and misery, in such a way that the verse contains the subject unfolded in the description that follows. We have deviated from the Masoretic pointing, and arranged the verse into three members, as in the succeeding verses, which nearly throughout form tristichs, and have been divided into two halves by means of the Athnach; but we agree with the remark of Gerlach, “that, according to the sense, **היתה לאַלְמָנָה** and not **היתה לְמָס** is the proper antithesis to **אִיכָּה**.” **רֹבֶתִי בְּנָוִים** is here, as in ii. 1, iv. 1, 2, an expression of complaint mingled with astonishment; so in Jer. xlviii. 17, Isa. i. 21. “She sits solitary” (cf. Jer. xv. 17) is intensified by “she has become like a widow.” Her sitting alone is a token of deep sorrow (cf. Neh. i. 4), and, as applied to a city, is a figure of desolation; cf. Isa. xxvii. 10. Here, however, the former reference is the main one; for Jerusalem is personified as a woman, and, with regard to its numerous population, is viewed as the mother of a great multitude of children. **רֹבֶתִי** is a form of the construct state, lengthened by *Yod compaginis*, found thrice in this verse, and also in Isa. i. 21, elegiac composition; such forms are used, in general, only in poetry that preserves and affects the antique style, and reproduces its peculiar ring.¹ According to the two-fold meaning of **רֹבֶתִי** (*much* and *great*), **רֹבֶתִי** in the first clause designates the multiplicity, multitude of the population; in the

¹ On the different views regarding the origin and meaning of this *Yod compaginis*, cf. Fr. W. M. Philippi, *Wesen u. Ursprung des Status constr. im Hebr.* S. 96 ff. This writer (S. 152 ff.) takes it to be the remnant of a primitive Semitic noun-inflexion, which has been preserved only in a number of composite proper names of ancient origin [e.g. **מֶלֶפִידָק**, etc.]; in the words **בָּבָשׂ**, **חָבָשׂ**, and **מָבָשׂ**, in which it has become fused with the third radical into a long vowel; and elsewhere only between two words standing in the construct relation [see Ges. § 90; Ewald, § 211].

second, the greatness or dignity of the position that Jerusalem assumed among the nations, corresponding to the שָׂרִית בְּפָרִינּוֹת, “a princess among the provinces.” מִדְיָנָה, from דִין (properly, the circuit of judgment or jurisdiction), is the technical expression for the provinces of the empires in Asia (cf. Esth. i. 1, 22, etc.), and hence, after the exile, was used of Judah, Ezra ii. 1, Neh. vii. 6, and in 1 Kings xx. 17 of the districts in the kingdom of Israel. Here, however, are not the circuits or districts of Judah (Thenius), but the provinces of the heathen nations rendered subject to the kingdom of Israel under David and Solomon (corresponding to הַגּוּם), as in Eccles. ii. 8. Jerusalem was formerly a princess among the provinces, during the flourishing period of the Jewish kingdom under David and Solomon. The writer keeps this time before his mind, in order to depict the contrast between the past and present. The city that once ruled over nations and provinces has now become but dependent on others. מַמְּ (the derivation of which is disputed) does not mean soccage or tribute, but the one who gives soccage service, a soccager; see on Ex. i. 11 and 1 Kings iv. 6. The words, “The princess has become a soccager,” signify nothing more than, “She who once ruled over peoples and countries has now fallen into abject servitude,” and are not (with Thenius) to be held as “referring to the fact that the remnant that has been left behind, or those also of the former inhabitants of the city who have returned home, have been set to harder labour by the conquerors.” When we find the same writer inferring from this, that these words presuppose a state of matters in which the country round Jerusalem has been for some time previously under the oppression of Chaldean officers, and moreover holding the opinion that the words “how she sits . . .” could only have been written by one who had *for a considerable period* been looking on Jerusalem in its desolate condition, we can only wonder at such an utter want of power to understand poetic language.—Ver. 2. In this sorrow of hers she has not a single comforter, since all her friends from whom she could expect consolation have become faithless to her, and turned enemies. בְּכֹתֶבֶת, “weeping she weeps,” *i.e.* she weeps very much, or bitterly, not continually (Meier); the inf. abs. before the verb does not express the continuation, but the intensity of

the action [Gesenius, § 131, 3, *a*; Ewald, § 312]. נַּיְלָהּ, “in the night,” not “on into the night” (Ewald). The weeping by night does not exclude, but includes, weeping by day; cf. ii. 18 f. Night is mentioned as the time when grief and sorrow are wont to give place to sleep. When tears do not cease to flow even during the night, the sorrow must be overwhelming. The following clause, “and her tears are upon her cheek,” serves merely to intensify, and must not be placed (with Thenius) in antithesis to what precedes: “while her sorrow shows itself *most violently* during the loneliness of the night, her cheeks are yet always wet with tears (even during the day).” But the greatness of this sorrow of heart is due to the fact that she has no comforter, —a thought which is repeated in vers. 9, 16, 17, and 21. For her friends are faithless, and have become enemies. “Lovers” and “friends” are the nations with which Jerusalem made alliances, especially Egypt (cf. Jer. ii. 36 f.); then the smaller nations round about,—Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Phoenicians, with which Zedekiah had conspired against the king of Babylon, Jer. xxvii. 3. Testimony is given in Ps. xxxvii. 7 to the hostile dealing on the part of the Edomites against Judah at the destruction of Jerusalem; and Ezekiel (chap. xxv. 3, 6) charges the Ammonites and Tyrians with having shown malicious delight over the fall of Jerusalem; but the hostility of the Moabites is evident from the inimical behaviour of their King Baalis towards Judah, mentioned in Jer. xl. 14.

With ver. 3 begins the specific account of the misery over which Jerusalem sorrows so deeply. Judah has gone into exile, but she does not find any rest there among the nations. “Judah” is the population not merely of Jerusalem, but of the whole kingdom, whose deportation is bewailed by Jerusalem as the mother of the whole country. Although יְהִקָּה designates the people, and not the country, it is construed as a feminine, because the inhabitants are regarded as the daughter of the land; cf. Ewald, § 174, *b* [and Gesenius, § 107, 4, *a*]. מַעֲנִי וּנוֹ' has been explained, since J. D. Michaelis, by most modern expositors (Rosenmüller, Maurer, Ewald, Thenius, Nägelsbach), and previously by Calvin, as referring to the cause of the emigration, “from (because of) misery and much servitude;”

and in harmony with this view, גָּלְתָה יְהוּדָה has been understood, not of the deportation of Judah into exile, but of the voluntary emigration of the fugitives who sought to escape from the power of the Chaldeans by fleeing into foreign countries, partly before and partly after the destruction of Jerusalem. But this interpretation neither agrees with the meaning of the words nor the context. Those fugitives cannot be designated "Judah," because, however numerous one may think they were, they formed but a fraction of the inhabitants of Judah: the flower of the nation had been carried off to Babylon into exile, for which the usual word is גָּלָה. The context also requires us to refer the words to involuntary emigration into exile. For, in comparison with this, the emigration of fugitives to different countries was so unimportant a matter that the writer could not possibly have been silent regarding the deportation of the people, and placed this secondary consideration in the foreground as the cause of the sorrow. מְעַנֵּן is not to be taken in a causal sense, for מְעַנֵּן simply denotes the coming out of a certain condition, "out of misery," into which Judah had fallen through the occupation of the country, first by Pharaoh-Necho, then by the Chaldeans; and לְבַעֲרָה does not mean "much service," but "much labour." For עֲבָרָה does not mean "service" (=עֲבָרוֹת), but "labour, work, business," *e.g.* עֲבָרָת הַפְּלָקָה, "the service of the king," *i.e.* the service to be rendered to the king in the shape of work (1 Chron. xxvi. 30), and the labour connected with public worship (1 Chron. ix. 13, xxviii. 14, etc.); here, in connection with עַנֵּן, it means severe labour and toil which the people had to render, partly for the king, that he might get ready the tribute imposed on the country, and partly to defend the country and the capital against those who sought to conquer them. Although Judah had wandered out from a condition of misery and toil into exile, yet even there she found no rest among the nations, just as Moses had already predicted to the faithless nation, Deut. xxviii. 65. All her pursuers find her בֵּין הַצָּרִים, *inter angustias* (Vulgate). This word denotes "straits," narrow places where escape is impossible (Ps. cxvi. 3, cxviii. 5), or circumstances in life from which no escape can be found.—Ver. 4. Zion (*i.e.* Jerusalein, as the holy city) is laid waste; feasts and rejoicing have disappeared from it.

“The ways of Zion” are neither the streets of Jerusalem (Rosenmüller), which are called **תְּמִזְבֵּחַ**, nor the highways or main roads leading to Zion from different directions (Thenius, who erroneously assumes that the temple, which was situated on Moriah, together with its fore-courts, could only be reached through Zion), but the roads or highways leading to Jerusalem. These are “mourning,” *i.e.*, in plain language, desolate, deserted, because there are no longer any going up to Jerusalem to observe the feasts. For this same reason the gates of Zion (*i.e.* the city gates) are also in ruins, because there is no longer any one going out and in through them, and men no longer assemble there. The reason why the priests and the virgins are here conjoined as representatives of the inhabitants of Jerusalem is, that lamentation is made over the cessation of the religious feasts. The virgins are here considered as those who enlivened the national festivals by playing, singing, and dancing: Jer. xxxi. 13; Ps. lxviii. 26; Judg. xxi. 19, 21; Ex. xv. 20. **נִגְנָה** (Niphal of **גִּנְהָה**) is used here, as in Zeph. ii. 13, of sorrow over the cessation of the festivals. Following the arbitrary rendering, *ἀργόμενοι*, of the LXX., Ewald would alter the word in the text into **נִגְנָה**, “carried captive.” But there is no necessity for this: he does not observe that this rendering does not harmonize with the parallelism of the clauses, and that **גִּנְהָה** means to drive away, but not to lead captive.¹ **אָהִיא**, “and she (Zion) herself” is in bitterness (cf. Ruth i. 13, 20), *i.e.* she feels bitter sorrow. In vers. 6, 7, are mentioned the causes of this grief.—Ver. 5. Her adversaries or oppressors, in relation to her, have become the head (and Judah thus the tail), as was threatened, Deut. xxviii. 44; whereas, according to ver. 13 in that same address of Moses, the reverse was intended. Her enemies, knowing that their power is supreme, and that Judah has been completely vanquished, are quite at ease, secure (**לְשָׁבֵב**, cf. Jer. xii. 1). This unhappy fate Zion has brought on herself through the multitude of her own transgressions. Her children (**בָּנִים**, children of tender age) are driven away by the enemy like a flock. The comparison to a flock of lambs is indicated by **לְפָנֵי**. But

¹ See, however, 1 Sam. xx. 2, with Keil's own rendering, and Isa. xx. 4, with Delitzsch's translation.—Tr.

Zion has not merely lost what she loves most (the tender children), but all her glory ; so that even her princes, enfeebled by hunger, cannot escape the pursuers, who overtake them and make them prisoners. Like deer that find no pasture, they flee exhausted before the pursuer. בְּאַיִלִים has been rendered ὡς κριοὶ by the LXX., and *ut arietes* by the Vulgate ; hence Kalkschmidt, Böttcher (*Aehrenl.* S. 94), and Thenius would read בְּאַיִלִם, against which Rosenmüller has remarked : *perperam, nam hirci non sunt fugacia animalia, sed cervi.* Raschi had already indicated the point of the comparison in the words, *quibus nullae vires sunt ad effugiendum, fame eorum robore debilitato.* The objections raised against בְּאַיִלִים as the correct reading are founded on the erroneous supposition that the subject treated of is the carrying away of the princes into exile ; and that for the princes, in contrast with the young, no more suitable emblem could be chosen than the rami. But רֹאשׁ does not mean “the driver,” him who leads or drives the captives into exile, but “the pursuer,” who runs after the fugitive and seeks to catch him. The words treat of the capture of the princes : the flight of the king and his princes at the taking of Jerusalem (2 Kings xxv. 3 f.) hovered before the writer’s mind. For such a subject, the comparison of the fugitive princes to starved or badly fed rams is inappropriate ; but it is suitable enough to compare them with harts which had lost all power to run, because they had been unable to find any pasture, and בְּלֹא-כַּח (without strength, *i.e.* in weakness) are pursued and caught.

The loss of all her magnificence (ver. 7) brings to the remembrance of the sorrowing city, in her trouble, the former days of her now departed glory. “Jerusalem” is not the totality of those who are carried away (Thenius), but the city personified as the daughter of Zion (cf. ver. 6). “The days of her affliction,” etc., is not the direct object of “remembers,” as Pareau and Kalkschmidt assume, with the LXX. ; the object is “all her pleasant things.” If “the days of her affliction” were also intended to be the object, “all her pleasant things” would be preceded by the copula *וְ*, which Pareau indeed supplies, but arbitrarily. Moreover, the combination of the days of misery with the glory of bygone days is inappropriate,

because Jerusalem feels her present misery directly, and does not need first to call them to remembrance. “The days of her affliction,” etc., is the accusative of duration. Living through the times of her adversity, Jerusalem thinks of former happy times, and this remembrance increases her sorrow. מִרְזִיכִים occurs only here, in iii. 19 and in Isa. lviii. 7: in meaning it is connected with רַגֵּד, *vagari*, and signifies roaming,—not voluntary, but compulsory,—rejection, persecution; while the adjective מְרוֹאִים, found in Isaiah, is, as regards its form, taken from מְרוֹד, which is cognate with רַגֵּד. מְחוֹמָדִים or מְחוֹמָרִים (ver. 11, *Kethib*) is perhaps used in a more general sense than מְחוֹמָדִים, ii. 4 and i. 11 (*Qeri*), and signifies what is costly, splendid, viz. gracious gifts, both of a temporal and spiritual kind, which Israel formerly possessed, while signifies costly treasures. “The days of old” are the times of Moses and Joshua, of David and Solomon. In the words, “when her people fell,” etc., the days of misery are more exactly specified. The suffix in לְאַתָּה refers to Jerusalem. אֶלְיָהִים are the foes into whose power Jerusalem fell helplessly, not specially the escorts of those who were carried away (Thenius). They made a mockery of her מְשֻׁבְּתִים. This word is ἀπ. λεγ. It is not identical in meaning with שְׁבָתוֹת, *sabbata* (Vulgate, Luther, etc.), though connected with it; nor does it signify *deletiones*, destructions (Gesenius), but *cessationes*. This last rendering, however, is not to be taken according to the explanation of Rosenmüller: *quod cessasset omnis ille decor, qui nominatus este ante, principatus et prosper rerum status*; but rather as L. Capellus in his *nott. crit.* expresses it: *quod nunc terra ejus deserta jacet nec colitur et quasi cessat et feriatur*, though he does not quite exhaust the meaning. As Gerlach rightly remarks, the expression is “evidently used with reference to the threatenings given in the law, Lev. xxvi. 34, 35, that the land would observe its Sabbaths,—that it will keep them during the whole period of the desolation, when Israel is in the land of his enemies.” We must not, however, restrict the reference merely to the uncultivated state of the fields, but extend it so that it shall be applied to cessation from all kinds of employment, even those connected with the worship of God, which were necessary for the hallowing of the Sabbath. The mockery

of enemies does not apply to the Jewish celebration of the Sabbath (to which Grotius refers the words), but to the cessation of the public worship of the Lord, inasmuch as the heathen, by destroying Jerusalem and the temple, fancied they had not only put an end to the worship of the God of the Jews, but also conquered the God of Israel as a helpless national deity, and made a mock of Israel's faith in Jehovah as the only true God.—Ver. 8 f. But Jerusalem has brought this unutterable misery on herself through her grievous sins. חטאתה is intensified by the noun חטאת, instead of the inf. abs., as in Jer. xlvi. 5. Jerusalem has sinned grievously, and therefore has become an object of aversion. נִזְהָה does not mean *eis σάλον* (LXX.), or *instabilis* (Vulgate); nor is it, with the Chaldee, Raschi, and most of the ancient expositors, to be derived from נָזַד: we must rather, with modern expositors, regard it as a lengthened form of נִזְהָה, which indeed is the reading given in twenty codices of Kennicott. Regarding these forms, cf. Ewald, § 84, a. נִזְהָה (*prop.* what one should flee from) signifies in particular the uncleanness of the menstrual discharge in women, Lev. xii. 2, 5, etc.; then the uncleanness of a woman in this condition, Lev. xv. 19, etc.; here it is transferred to Jerusalem, personified as such an unclean woman, and therefore shunned. לִזְהָה, the Hiphil of לִזְהָה (as to the form, cf. Ewald, § 114, c), occurs only in this passage, and signifies to esteem lightly, the opposite of בְּפָרָה, to esteem, value highly; hence לִזְהָה, “despised,” ver. 11, as in Jer. xv. 19. Those who formerly esteemed her—her friends, and those who honoured her, *i.e.* her allies—now despise her, because they have seen her nakedness. The nakedness of Jerusalem means her sins and vices that have now come to the light. She herself also, through the judgment that has befallen her, has come to see the infamy of her deeds, sighs over them, and turns away for shame, *i.e.* withdraws from the people so that they may no longer look on her in her shame. In ver. 9 the figure of uncleanness is further developed. Her uncleanness sticks to the hems or skirts of her garment. חַטָּאתְךָ is the defilement caused by touching a person or thing Levitically unclean, Lev. v. 3, vii. 21; here, therefore, it means defilement by sins and crimes. This has now been revealed by the judgment, because

she did not think of her end. These words point to the warning given in the song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. 29: "If they were wise, they would understand this (that apostasy from the Lord brings heavy punishment after it), they would think of their end," i.e. the evil issue of continued resistance to God's commands. But the words are especially a quotation from Isa. xlvi. 7, where they are used of Babylon, that thought she would always remain mistress, and did not think of the end of her pride; therefore on her also came the sentence, "Come down from thy glory, sit in the dust," Isa. xlvi. 1, cf. Jer. xlvi. 18. Jerusalem has now experienced this also; she has come down wonderfully, or fallen from the height of her glory into the depths of misery and disgrace, where she has none to comfort her, and is constrained to sigh, "O Lord, behold my misery!" These words are to be taken as a sigh from the daughter of Zion, deeply humbled through shame and repentance for her sins. This is required by the whole tenor of the words, and confirmed by a comparison with vers. 11 and 20. פֶּלְאִים is used adverbially; cf. Ewald, § 204, b [Gesenius, § 100, 2, b]. There is no need for supplying anything after הַנְּדִיל, cf. Jer. xlvi. 26, 42, Dan. viii. 4, 8, 11, 25, although עַזְּשָׁת originally stood with it, e.g. Joel ii. 20; cf. Ewald, § 122, c [and Gesenius' *Lexicon*, s.v. נְדִיל]. The clause בַּיִת הַנְּדִיל, which assigns the reason, refers not merely to the sighing of Jerusalem, but also to the words, "and she came down wonderfully." The boasting of the enemy shows itself in the regardless, arrogant treatment not merely of the people and their property, but also of their holy things. This is specially mentioned in ver. 10. The enemy has spread out his hand over all her jewels (מְחֻמְדָתָה), the costly treasures of Jerusalem which were plundered), and even forced into the sanctuary of the Lord to spoil it of its treasures and vessels. C. B. Michaelis, Thenius, Gerlach, Nügelsbach, etc., would restrict the meaning of מְחֻמְדָתָה to the precious things of the sanctuary; but not only are there no sufficient reasons for this, but the structure of the clauses is against it. Neither does the expression, "all our precious things," in Isa. lxiv. 10, signify merely the articles used in public worship on which the people had placed their desire; nor are "all her pleasant vessels" merely the sacred vessels of

the temple. In the latter passage, the suffix in מִתְמַצֵּה refers to Jerusalem; and inasmuch as the burning of all the palaces of the city (אֶרְמָנָתָיו) has been mentioned immediately before, we are so much the less at liberty to restrict “all her precious vessels” to the vessels of the temple, and must rather, under that expression, include all the precious vessels of the city, *i.e.* of the palaces and the temple. And Delitzsch has already remarked, on Isa. lxiv. 10, that “under מִתְמַצֵּה may be included favourite spots, beautiful buildings, pleasure gardens; and only the parallelism induces us to think especially of articles used in public worship.” But when Thenius, in the passage now before us, brings forward the succeeding words, “for she hath seen,” as a proof that by “all her pleasant things” we are to understand especially the vessels and utensils of the temple, he shows that he has not duly considered the contents of the clause introduced by בַּ (for). The clause characterizes the enemy’s forcing his way into the sanctuary, *i.e.* the temple of Jerusalem, as an unheard of act of sacrilege, because בָּנִים were not to enter even into the לְהָמָרָה of Jahveh. The subject treated of is not by any means the robbing of the temple—the plundering of its utensils and vessels. The prohibition against the coming, *i.e.* the receiving of foreigners into the “congregation,” is given, Deut. xxiii. 4, with regard to the Ammonites and Moabites: this neither refers to the *jus connubii* (Grotius, Rosenmüller), nor to the civil rights of Jewish citizens (Kalkschmidt), but to reception into religious communion with Israel, the *ecclesia* of the Old Covenant (הָעֵדָה הָלְכָה). In Deut. xxiii. 8, the restriction is relaxed in favour of the Edomites and Egyptians, but in Ezek. xliv. 7, 9, in accordance with the *ratio legis*, extended to all uncircumcised sons of strangers. Hence, in the verse now before us, we must not, with Rosenmüller and Thenius, restrict the reference of בָּנִים to the Ammonites and Moabites as accomplices of the Chaldeans in the capture of Jerusalem and the plundering of the temple (2 Kings xxiv. 2); rather the בָּנִים are identical with those mentioned in the first member of the verse as אֶצְרָן, *i.e.* the Chaldeans, so called not “because their army was made up of different nationalities, but because the word contains the notice of their being *heathens*,—profane ones who had forced

into the sanctuary" (Gerlach). But if we look at the structure of the clauses, we find that "for she saw," etc., is parallel to "for the enemy hath boasted" of ver. 9; and the clause, "for she saw nations coming," etc., contains a further evidence of the deep humiliation of Jerusalem; so that we may take **כִּי** as showing the last step in a climax, since the connection of the thought is this: For the enemy hath boasted, spreading his hand over all her precious things,—he hath even forced his way into the sanctuary of the Lord. If this is mentioned as the greatest disgrace that could befall Jerusalem, then the spreading out of the hands over the precious things of Jerusalem cannot be understood of the plundering of the temple. The construction **רָאָתָה נָּגִים בְּאָגָם** is in sense exactly similar to the Latin *vidit gentes venisse*, cf. Ewald, § 284, b; and on the construction **אָגָם לֹא יָבִיא**, cf. Ewald, § 336, b. **בְּקָהָל לֹא** does not stand for **בְּקָהָל** (LXX., Pareau, Rosenmüller), for **קָהָל** is not the congregation of Judah, but that of Jahveh; and the meaning is: They shall not come to thee, the people of God, into the congregation of the Lord.—Ver. 11. Besides this disgrace, famine also comes on her. All her people, *i.e.* the whole of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, sigh after bread, and part with their jewels for food, merely to prolong their life. The participles **נְאָנָחִים, נְבָקָשִׁים**, are not to be translated by preterites; they express a permanent condition of things, and the words are not to be restricted in their reference to the famine during the siege of the city (Jer. xxxvii. 21, xxxviii. 9, lii. 6). Even after it was reduced, the want of provisions may have continued; so that the inhabitants of the city, starved into a surrender, delivered up their most valuable things to those who plundered them, for victuals to be obtained from these enemies. Yet it is not correct to refer the words to the present sad condition of those who were left behind, as distinguished from their condition during the siege and immediately after the taking of the city (Gerlach). This cannot be inferred from the participles. The use of these is fully accounted for by the fact that the writer sets forth, as present, the whole of the misery that came on Jerusalem during the siege, and which did not immediately cease with the capture of the city; he describes it as a state of matters that still continues. As to **מִחְמִידָהּ נִפְשָׁת**, see on ver. 7. **חַשֵּׁב נִפְשָׁת**, "to

bring back the soul," the life, *i.e.* by giving food to revive one who is nearly fainting, to keep in his life (= **הַשִּׁבֵּת רַעַת**); cf. Ruth iv. 15, 1 Sam. xxx. 12, and in a spiritual sense, Ps. xix. 8, xxiii. 3. In the third member of the verse, the sigh which is uttered as a prayer (ver. 9b) is repeated in an intensified form; and the way is thus prepared for the transition to the lamentation and suppliant request of Jerusalem, which forms the second half of the poem.

Vers. 12-16. *The lamentation of the city.*—Ver. 12. The first words, **לֹא אַלְכֵם**, are difficult to explain. The LXX. have *οὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς*; but the reading ought certainly to be *οὶ π. ὑ.* The Vulgate is, *o vos omnes*; the Chaldee, *adjuro vos omnes*. They all seem to have taken **לֹא** as an exclamation. Hence Le Clerc and others would read **לֹא**; but in this case one would require to supply a verb: thus, Le Clerc renders *utinam adspiciatis*, or, "O that my cry might reach you!" But these insertions are very suspicious. The same holds true of the explanation offered by J. D. Michaelis in his edition of Lowth on Hebrew Poetry, Lect. xxii.: *non vobis, transeuntes in via, hæc acclamo* (viz. the closing words of ver. 11): this is decidedly opposed by the mere fact that passers-by certainly could not regard a call addressed to Jahveh as applying to them. Without supplying something or other, the words, as they stand, remain incomprehensible. Nægelsbach would connect them with what follows: "[Look] not to yourselves . . . but look and see . . ." But the antithesis, "Look not upon yourselves, but look on me (or on my sorrow)," has no proper meaning. If we compare the kindred thought presented in ver. 18, "Hear, all ye peoples, and behold my sorrow," then **לֹא אַלְכֵם** seems to express an idea corresponding to **שְׁמַע**. But we obtain this result only if we take the words as a question, as if **אַל** = **הַל**, though not in the sense of an asseveration (which would be unsuitable here, for which reason also **הַל** is not used); the question is shown to be such merely by the tone, as in Ex. viii. 22, 2 Sam. xxiii. 5. Thus, we might render the sense with Gerlach: Does not (my sighing—or, more generally, my misery—come) to you? The Syriac, Lowth, Ewald, Thenius, and Vaihinger have taken the words as a question; Ewald, following Prov. viii. 4, would supply **אָמַרְתִּי**. But such an insertion gives a rendering which

is both harsh and unjustifiable, although it lies at the foundation of Luther's "I say unto you." Hence we prefer Gerlach's explanation, and accordingly give the free rendering, "Do ye not observe, *sc.* what has befallen me,—or, my misery?" The words are, in any case, intended to prepare the way for, and thereby render more impressive, the summons addressed to all those passing by to look on and consider her sorrow. **לֹא** is passive (Poal): "which is done to me." Since **הָנָה** has no object, the second **אֲשֶׁר** does not permit of being taken as parallel with the first, though the Chaldee, Rosenmüller, Kalkschmidt, and others have so regarded it, and translate: "with which Jahveh hath afflicted me." With Ewald, Thenius, Gerlach, etc., we must refer it to **לְ**: "me whom Jahveh hath afflicted." The expression, "on the day of the burning of His anger," is pretty often found in Jeremiah; see iv. 8, 26, xxv. 37, etc.—In vers. 13–15, the misfortunes that have befallen Jerusalem are enumerated in a series of images. "Out from the height (*i.e.* down from heaven) hath He sent fire into my bones;" **וַיַּרְאֵנָה** is rendered by Luther, "and let it have the mastery" (Ger. *und dasselbige walten lassen*). Thenius explains this as being correct, and accordingly seeks to point the word **וַיַּרְאֵנָה**, while Ewald takes **רָדָה** to be cognate with **רָתָח**, and translates it "made them red-hot;" and Rosenmüller, following N. G. Schröder, attributes to **רָדָה**, from the Arabic, the meaning *collisit, percussit lapide*. All these explanations are not only far-fetched and incapable of lexical vindication, but also unnecessary. The change of vowels, so as to make it the Hiphil, is opposed by the fact that **רָדָה**, in the Hiphil, does not mean to cause to manage, rule, but to tread down, subdue (Isa. xli. 2). In Kal, it means to tread, tread down, and rule, as in Jer. v. 31, where Gesenius and Dietrich erroneously assume the meaning of "striding, going," and accordingly render this passage, "it stalks through them." The lexically substantiated meaning, "subdue, rule, govern, (or, more generally,) overpower," is quite sufficient for the present passage, since **רָדָה** is construed not merely with **בָּ**, but also with the accusative: the subject is **צְבָא**, which is also construed as a masc. in Jer. xlvi. 45; and the suffix **בָּ**— may either be taken as a neuter, or referred to "my bones," without compelling us to explain it as meaning *unum*

quodque os (Rosenmüller, etc.). The bones are regarded as bodily organs in which the pain is most felt, and are not to be explained away allegorically to mean *urbes meas munitas* (Chaldee). While fire from above penetrated the bones, God from beneath placed nets for the feet which thus were caught. On this figure, cf. Jer. i. 24, Hos. vii. 12, etc. The consequence of this was that "He turned me back," *ita ut progredi pedemque extricare non possem, sed capta detinerer* (C. B. Michaelis),—not, "he threw me down backwards," *i.e.* made me fall heavily (Thenius). "He hath made me desolate" (שׁוֹטֵמֶת),—not *obstupescentem, perturbatam, desperatam* (Rosenmüller); the same word is applied to Tamar, 2 Sam. xiii. 20, as one whose happiness in life has been destroyed. "The whole day (*i.e.* constantly, uninterruptedly) sick," or ill. The city is regarded as a person whose happiness in life has been destroyed, and whose health has been broken. This miserable condition is represented in ver. 14, under another figure, as a yoke laid by God on the people for their sins. שְׁקָד, ἄπ. λεγ., is explained by Kimchi as נִקְשָׁר אוֹ נִתְחַבֵּר, *compactum vel colligatum*, according to which שְׁקָד would be allied to עֲקָעַ. This explanation suits the context; on the other hand, neither the interpretation based on the Talmudic שְׁקָד, *punxit, stimulavit*, which is given by Raschi and Aben Ezra, nor the interpretations of the LXX., Syriac, and Vulgate, which are founded on the reading שְׁקָד, *נִשְׁקָד*, harmonize with עַל, which must be retained, as is shown by the words עַל־עַל־צְוָאָרִי. Ewald supposes that שְׁקָד was the technical expression for the harnessing on of the yoke. "The yoke of my transgressions" (not "of my chastisements," as Gesenius, Rosenmüller, and Ewald think) means the yoke formed of the sins. The notion of punishment is not contained in עַל, but in the imposition of the yoke upon the neck, by which the misdeeds of sinful Jerusalem are laid on her, as a heavy, depressing burden which she must bear. These sins become interwoven or intertwine themselves (שְׁתַּרְנָגֶת), after the manner of intertwined vine-tendrils (שְׁרִינִים, Gen. xl. 10; cf. remarks on Job xl. 17), as the Chaldee paraphrase well shows; and, through this interweaving, form the yoke that has come on the neck of the sinful city. *Veluti ex contortis funibus aut complicatis lignis jugum quoddam construitur; ita h. l. prævaricationis tanquam materia insupportabilis*

jugi considerantur (C. B. Michaelis). **עַלְהָ** is used of the imposition of the yoke, as in Num. xix. 2, 1 Sam. vi. 7. The effect of the imposition of this yoke is: “it hath made my strength to stumble (fail).” Pareau, Thenius, Vaihinger, and Nägelsbach assume God as the subject of the verb **הַבָּשַׁל**; but this neither accords with the current of the description, nor with the emphatic mention of the subject **אֶרְצִי** in the clause succeeding this. Inasmuch as, in the first member of the verse, God is not the subject, but the address takes a passive turn, it is only the leading word **הַי** that can be the subject of **הַבָּשַׁל**: the yoke of sins which, twined together, have come on the neck, has made the strength stumble, *i.e.* broken it. This effect of the yoke of sins is stated, in the last member, in simple and unfigurative speech: “the Lord hath given me into the hands of those whom I cannot withstand,” *i.e.* before whom I cannot maintain my ground. On the construction **בְּזַי לֹא אִקְרַב**, cf. Ewald, § 333, *b*; Gesenius, § 116, 3. **קַם** is here viewed in the sense of standing fast, maintaining ground, as in Ps. xviii. 39; and, construed with the accusative, it signifies, to withstand any one; its meaning is not *surgere*, which Thenius, following the Vulgate, would prefer: the construction here requires the active meaning of the verb.—In ver. 15 this thought is further carried out. **קָלַח** and **קָלַח**, “to lift up,” is only used in poetry; in Ps. cxix. 118 it takes the Aramaic meaning *vilipendere*, as if in reference to things that can be lifted easily; here it means *tollere*, to lift up, take away (LXX. **ἐξῆρε**, Vulgate *abstulit*), tear away forcibly, just as both meanings are combined in **נִשְׁאַל**: it does not mean to outweigh, or raise with a jerk,—the warriors being regarded as weighty things, that speedily were raised when the Chaldean power was thrown into the scale (Thenius, and Böttcher in his *Aehrenl.* S. 94). This meaning is not confirmed for the Piel by Job xxviii. 16, 19. **קָרָא מַעַד** does not mean to summon an assembly, *i.e.* the multitude of foes (Raschi, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Neumann), but to proclaim a festival (cf. ii. 22), because in ver. 4 and ii. 6 (cf. Lev. xxiii. 4) **מַעַד** denotes the feast-day, and in ver. 21 **קָרָא יוֹם** means to proclaim a day. **לְעַלְהָ** means “against me;” for those invited to the feast are the nations that God has invited to destroy the youths, *i.e.* the young troops of Jerusalem. These celebrate a feast like

that of the vintage, at which Jahveh treads the wine-press for the daughter of Judah, because her young men are cut off like clusters of grapes (Jer. vi. 9), and thrown into the wine-press (Joel iv. 13). The last judgment also is set forth under this figure, Isa. lxiii. 2 f.; Rev. xiv. 19 f., xix. 15. לְבַתְּאַלְמָתָה יְהוָה, “to (for) the virgin of Judah;” her young men are regarded as a mass of grapes, whose life-sap (blood) is trodden out in the wine-press. As to the expression בְּחִילַת בַּת, see on Jer. xiv. 17. “The addition of the word ‘virgin’ brings out the contrast between this fate, brought on through the enemy, at God’s command, and the peculiar privilege of Judah as the people of God, in being free from the attacks of enemies” (Gerlach).

Ver. 16 concludes this series of thoughts, since the address returns to the idea presented in ver. 12, and the unprecedented sorrow (ver. 12) gives vent to itself in tears. “Because of these things” refers to the painful realities mentioned in vers. 13-15, which Jerusalem has experienced. The form בָּזְקִיהָ is like the feminine form פָּרִיהָ in Ps. cxxviii. 3, Isa. xvii. 6; cf. Ges. § 75, Rem. 5. The repetition of “my eye” gives greater emphasis, and is quite in the style of Jeremiah; cf. iv. 19, vi. 14 (viii. 11), xxii. 29, xxiii. 25; the second עֵינִי is not to be expunged (Pareau and Thenius), although it is not found in the LXX., Vulgate, Arabic, and some codices. On יְרֹדָה מִים, cf. Jer. ix. 17, xiii. 17, xiv. 17. In these passages stands דְּמֹעֵה, but here מִים, as the stronger expression: the eye flows like water, as if it were running to the ground in water. Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, appositely cites the German “sich die Augen aus dem Kopfe weinen” [with which the English corresponds: “to weep one’s eyes out of his head”]. Still stronger is the expression in iii. 48. But the sorrow becomes thus grievous, because the weeping one has none to comfort her; friends who could comfort her have faithlessly forsaken her (cf. vers. 2, 9), and her sons are שׁוֹבְדִים, *i.e.* destroyed, not “astonished” (Jer. xviii. 16, xix. 8), but, as in ver. 13, made desolate, *i.e.* made so unhappy that they cannot bring their mother comfort in her misery. On מְשִׁיב נֶפֶשׁ, cf. ver. 11. “Because the enemy hath become strong,” *i.e.* prevailed (בָּרָךְ as in Jer. ix. 2).

Ver. 17. The complaint regarding the want of comforters is corroborated by the writer, who further develops this thought,

and gives some proof of it. By this contemplative digression he breaks in on the lamentation of the city, as if the voice of the weeping one were choked with tears; thus he introduces into the complaint a suitable pause, that both serves to divide the lamentation into two, and also brings a turn in its contents. It is in vain that Zion stretches out her hands (**פִּרְשָׁת**, to make a spreading out with the hands) for comforters and helpers; there is none she can embrace, for Jahveh has given orders against Jacob, [that] those round about him should act as oppressors. **כָּבֵבִי** are the neighbouring nations round about Israel. These are all of hostile disposition, and strive but to increase his misery; cf. ver. 2. Jerusalem has become their abomination (cf. ver. 8), since God, in punishment for sins, has exposed her before the heathen nations (cf. ver. 8). **בּוּנִיָּת**, "between them," the neighbouring nations, who live round about Judah. The thought that Jahveh has decreed the suffering which has come on Jerusalem, is laid to heart by her who makes complaint, so that, in ver. 18, she owns God's justice, and lets herself be roused to ask for pity, vers. 19-22.

Starting with the acknowledgment that Jahveh is righteous, because Jerusalem has opposed His word, the sorrowing one anew (ver. 18, as in ver. 12) calls on the nations to regard her sorrow, which attains its climax when her children, in the bloom of youth, are taken captives by the enemy. But she finds no commiseration among men; for some, her former friends, prove faithless, and her counsellors have perished (ver. 19); therefore she turns to God, making complaint to Him of her great misery (ver. 20), because the rest, her enemies, even rejoice over her misery (ver. 21): she prays that God may punish these. Gerlach has properly remarked, that this conclusion of the chapter shows Jerusalem does not set forth her fate as an example for the warning of the nations, nor desires thereby to obtain commiseration from them in her present state (Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Thenius, Vaihinger); but that the apostrophe addressed to the nations, as well as that to passers-by (ver. 12), is nothing more than a poetic turn, used to express the boundless magnitude of this her sorrow and her suffering. On the confession "Righteous is Jahveh," cf. Jer. xii. 1, Deut. xxxii. 4, 2 Chron. xii. 6, Ps. cxix. 37, etc. "Because I have rebelled

against His mouth" (*i.e.* His words and commandments), therefore I am suffering what I have merited. On מִרְאַת פִּיהָ, cf. Num. xx. 24, 1 Kings xiii. 26. כל-עָם (without the article, which the *Qeri* supplies) is a form of expression used in poetry, which often drops the article; moreover, we must here bear in mind, that it is not by any means the idea of the totality of the nations that predominates, but nations are addressed merely in indefinite generality: the expression in the text means nations of all places and countries. In order to indicate the greatness of her grief, the sorrowing one mentions the carrying into captivity of the young men and virgins, who are a mother's joy and hope.—Ver. 19 is not a continuation of the direct address to the nations, to whom she complains of her distress, but merely a complaint to God regarding the sorrow she endures. The perfects קָרְאָתִי, רָמְנִי, are not preterites, and thus are not to be referred to the past, as if complaint were made that, in the time of need, the lovers of Jerusalem forsook her; they rather indicate accomplished facts, whose consequences reach down to the present time. It was not merely in former times, during the siege, that Jerusalem called to her friends for help; but even now she still calls, that she may be comforted by them, yet all in vain. Her friends have deceived her, *i.e.* shamefully disappointed her expectations. From those who are connected with her, too, she can expect neither comfort nor counsel. The priests and the elders, as the helpers and advisers of the city,—the former as representing the community before God, and being the medium of His grace, the latter as being leaders in civil matters,—pined away (עָלָה, *exspirare*; here, to pine away through hunger, and expire). בַּיּ is a temporal particle: "when they were seeking for bread" to prolong their life (הָשִׁיבָה as in ver. 11). The LXX. have added καὶ οὐχ εὑρούν, which Thenius is inclined to regard as a portion of the original text; but it is very evidently a mere conjecture from the context, and becomes superfluous when בַּיּ is taken as a particle of time.—Ver. 20. Since neither comfort nor advice is to be found with men, Jerusalem makes her complaint of need to God the Lord. "See, Jehovah, that I am distressed. My bowels glow." חַמְרָמָה, the passive enhancing form, from חַמֵּר, is found, besides, only in ii. 11, where the clause before

us is repeated, and in Job xvi. 16, where it is used of the countenance, and can only mean to be glowing red ; it is scarcely legitimate to derive it from חַמֵּר, *חַמֵּר*, to be made red, and must rather be referred to *חַמֵּס*, to ferment, rise into froth ; for even in Ps. lv. 9 חַמֵּר does not mean to be red, but to rise into froth. מָעִים, "bowels," are the nobler portions of the internal organs of the body, the seat of the affections ; cf. Delitzsch's *Biblical Psychology* (Clark's translation), p. 314 ff. "My heart has turned within me" is an expression used in Hos. xi. 8 to designate the feeling of compassion ; but here it indicates the most severe internal pain, which becomes thus agonizing through the consciousness of its being deserved on account of resistance to God. מָרָה for מָרָה, like בְּכָנוּ, Jer. xxii. 10, xxx. 19, etc. Both forms occur together in other verbs also ; cf. Olshausen, *Gram.* § 245, *h* [Ewald, § 238, *e* ; Gesen., § 75, Rem. 2]. But the judgment also is fearful ; for "without (מִחִלּוּן, *foris*, i.e. in the streets and the open country) the sword renders childless," through the slaughter of the troops ; "within (בְּפֶןְתָּה, in the houses) like death." It is difficult to account for the use of בְּ ; for neither the בְּ of comparison nor the so-called בְּ *veritatis* affords a suitable meaning ; and the transposition of the words into *sicut mors intus* (Rosenmüller, after Löwe and Wolfsolin) is an arbitrary change. Death, mentioned in connection with the sword, does not mean death in general, but special forms of death through maladies and plagues, as in Jer. xv. 2, xviii. 21, not merely the fever of hunger, Jer. xiv. 18 ; on the other hand, cf. Ezek. vii. 15, "the sword without, pestilence and hunger within." But the difficulty connected with בְּפֶןְתָּה is not thereby removed. The verb שָׁבֵל belongs to both clauses ; but "the sword" cannot also be the subject of the second clause, of which the nominative must be בְּפֶןְתָּה, "all that is like death," i.e. everything besides the sword that kills, all other causes of death,—pestilences, famine, etc. בְּ is used as in בְּמִרְאָה, Dan. x. 18. That this is the meaning is shown by a comparison of the present passage with Deut. xxxii. 25, which must have been before the writer's mind, so that he took the words of the first clause, viz. "without, the sword bereaves," almost as they stood, but changed בְּפֶןְתָּה into בְּבֵית בְּפֶןְתָּה וּמְחֻרְרִים אִימָה,—thus preferring

“what is like death,” instead of “terror,” to describe the cause of destruction. Calvin long ago hit the sense in his paraphrase *multæ mortes*, and the accompanying explanation: *utitur nota similitudinis, quasi diceret: nihil domi occurrere nisi mortale* (more correctly *mortaliter*). Much light is thrown on the expression by the parallel adduced by Kalkschmidt from *Eneid*, ii. 368, 369: *crudelis ubique Luctus, ubique pavor, et plurima mortis imago*.

From speaking of friends, a transition is made in ver. 21 to enemies. Regarding the explanation of Rosenmüller, *audiverunt quidem amici mei, a me implorati* ver. 19, *quod gemens ego . . . imo sunt omnes hostes mei*, Thenius observes that it introduces too much. This remark is still more applicable to his own interpretation: “People (certainly) hear how I sigh, (yet) I have no comforter.” The antithesis introduced by the insertion of “yet” destroys the simplicity of arrangement among the clauses, although C. B. Michaelis and Gerlach also explain the passage in the same manner. The subject of the words, “they have heard,” in the first clause, is not the friends who are said in ver. 19 to have been called upon for help, nor those designated in the second clause of ver. 21 as “all mine enemies,” but persons unnamed, who are only characterized in the second clause as enemies, because they rejoice over the calamity which they have heard of as having befallen Jerusalem. The first clause forms the medium of transition from the faithless friends (ver. 19) to the open enemies (ver. 21b); hence the subject is left undefined, so that one may think of friends and enemies. The foes rejoice that God has brought the evil on her. The words **הַבָּאֵת וְנִי'**, which follow, cannot also be dependent on **בַּי** (“that Thou hast brought the day which Thou hast announced”), inasmuch as the last clause, “and they shall be like me,” does not harmonize with them. Indeed, Nägelsbach and Gerlach, who assume that this is the connection of the clause “Thou hast brought,” etc., take **וְנִי' בְּ** adversatively: “but they shall be like me.” If, however, “they shall be,” etc., were intended to form an antithesis to “all mine enemies have heard,” etc., the former clause would be introduced by **בְּנִי**. The mere change of tense is insufficient to prove the point. It must further be borne in mind, that in such a case there

would be introduced by the words “ and they shall be,” etc., a new series of ideas, the second great division of the prayer ; but this is opposed by the arrangement of the clauses. The second portion of the prayer cannot be attached to the end of the verse. The new series of thoughts begins rather with “ Thou hast brought,” which the Syriac has rendered by the imperative, *venire fac*. Similarly Luther translates : “ then (therefore) let the day come.” C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Pareau, etc., also take the words optatively, referring to the Arabic idiom, according to which a wish is expressed in a vivid manner by the perfect. This optative use of the perfect certainly cannot be shown to exist in the Hebrew ; but perhaps it may be employed to mark what is viewed as certain to follow, in which case the Germans use the present. The use of the perfect shows that the occurrence expected is regarded as so certain to happen, that it is represented as if it had already taken place. The perfects in iii. 56-61 are taken in this sense by nearly all expositors. Similarly we take the clause now before us to mean, “ Thou bringest on the day which Thou hast proclaimed (announced),” *i.e.* the day of judgment on the nations, Jer. xxv., “ so that they become like me,” *i.e.* so that the foes who rejoice over my misfortune suffer the same fate as myself. “ The day [which] Thou hast proclaimed” has been too specifically rendered in the Vulgate, *adduxisti diem consolationis*, probably with a reference of the proclamation to Isa. xl. 2.—After this expression of certainty regarding the coming of a day of punishment for her enemies, there follows, ver. 22, the request that all the evil they have done to Jerusalem may come before the face of God, in order that He may punish it (cf. Ps. cix. 15 with ver. 14),—do to them as He has done to Jerusalem, because of her transgressions. The clause which assigns the reason (“ for many are my sighs,” etc.) does not refer to that which immediately precedes ; for neither the request that retribution should be taken, nor the confession of guilt (“ for all my transgressions”), can be accounted for by pointing to the deep misery of Jerusalem, inasmuch as her sighing and sickness are not brought on her by her enemies, but are the result of the sufferings ordained by God regarding her. The words contain the ground of the request that God

would look on the misery (ver. 20), and show to the wretched one the compassion which men refuse her. לְבַדְךָ is exactly the same expression as that in Jer. viii. 18 ; cf. also Isa. i. 5. The reason thus given for making the entreaty forms an abrupt termination, and with these words the sound of lamentation dies away.

CHAP. II.—LAMENTATION OVER THE JUDGMENT OF DESTRUCTION THAT HAS COME ON ZION AND THE DESOLATION OF JUDAH.

- 1 Alas ! how the Lord envelopes the daughter of Zion in His wrath !
He hath cast down the glory of Israel from heaven to earth ;
Nor hath He remembered His footstool in the day of His wrath.
- 2 The Lord hath swallowed up all the habitations of Jacob, He hath not spared :
He hath broken down, in His anger, the strongholds of the daughter of Judah ; He hath smitten [them] down to the earth.
He hath profaned the kingdom and its princes.
- 3 He hath cut off, in the burning of wrath, every horn of Israel ;
He hath drawn back His right hand from before the enemy,
And hath burned among Jacob like a flaming fire, [which] devours round about.
- 4 He hath bent His bow like an enemy, standing [with] His right hand like an adversary,
And He slew all the desires of the eye ;
On the tent of the daughter of Zion hath He poured out His fury like fire.
- 5 The Lord hath become like an enemy ; He hath swallowed up Israel.
He hath swallowed up all her palaces, He hath destroyed his strongholds,
And hath increased on the daughter of Judah groaning and moaning.
- 6 And He hath violently treated His own enclosure, like a garden ; He hath destroyed His own place of meeting :
Jahveh hath caused to be forgotten in Zion the festival and the Sabbath,
And in the fierceness of His wrath He hath rejected king and priest.
- 7 The Lord hath spurned His own altar, He hath abhorred His own sanctuary ;
He hath delivered into the hand of the enemy the walls of her palaces ;
They have made a noise in the house of Jahveh, as [on] the day of a festival.
- 8 Jahveh hath purposed to destroy the walls of the daughter of Zion :
He hath stretched out a line, He hath not drawn back His hand from demolishing ;
And He hath made the rampart and the [city] wall to mourn ; they sorrow together.

9 Her gates have sunk into the earth ; He hath destroyed and broken her bars :
 Her king and her princes are among the nations ; there is no law.
 Her prophets also find no vision from Jahveh.

10 The elders of the daughter of Zion sit upon the ground, they are silent ;
 They have cast up dust upon their head, they have clothed themselves with sackcloth garments :
 The virgins of Jerusalem have brought down their head to the earth.

11 Mine eyes waste away with tears, my bowels glow,
 My liver is poured out on the earth, because of the destruction of the daughter of my people ;
 Because the young child and the suckling pine away in the streets of the city.

12 They said to their mothers, Where is corn and wine ?
 When they were fainting like one wounded in the streets of the city,
 When their soul was poured out into the bosom of their mothers.

13 What shall I testify against thee ? what shall I compare to thee, O daughter of Jerusalem ?
 What shall I liken to thee, that I may comfort thee, O virgin daughter of Zion ?
 For thy destruction is great, like the sea ; who can heal thee ?

14 Thy prophets have seen for thee vanity and absurdity,
 And have not revealed thine iniquity, to turn thy captivity ;
 But they have seen for thee burdens of vanity, and expulsion.

15 All that pass by the way clap [their] hands against thee ;
 They hiss and shake their head against the daughter of Jerusalem,
 [saying,
 “Is] this the city that they call ‘ The perfection of beauty, a joy of the whole earth ? ’ ”

16 All thine enemies have opened their mouth against thee :
 They hiss and gnash the teeth ; they say, “ We have swallowed [her] ;
 Assuredly this is the day that we have expected ; we have found [it], we have seen [it]. ”

17 Jahveh hath done what He hath purposed :
 He hath executed His word which He commanded from the days of yore : He hath broken down, and hath not spared :
 And He hath made the enemy rejoice over thee ; He hath raised up the horn of thine adversaries.

18 Their heart crieth out unto the Lord.
 O wall of the daughter of Zion, let tears run down like a stream by day and by night :
 Give thyself no rest ; let not the apple of thine eye cease.

19 Arise, wail in the night ; at the beginning of the watches,
 Pour out thy heart like water before the face of the Lord :
 Lift up thine hands to Him for the soul of thy young children,
 That faint for hunger at the head of every street.

20 See, O Jahveh, and consider to whom Thou hast acted thus !
 Shall women eat their [body's] fruit, the children of their care ?
 Or shall priest and prophet be slain in the sanctuary of the Lord ?

21 The boy and the old man lie without, on the ground ;
 My virgins and my young men have fallen by the sword :
 Thou hast slain in the day of Thy wrath, Thou hast slaughtered, Thou
 hast not spared.

22 Thou summonest, as on a feast-day, my terrors round about ;
 And in the day of the wrath of Jahveh there was no fugitive or survivor
 Whom I would have nursed and brought up ; mine enemy destroyed
 them.

This second poem contains a new and more bitter lamentation regarding the fall of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah ; and it is distinguished from the first, partly by the bitterness of the complaint, but chiefly by the fact that while, in the first, the oppressed, helpless, and comfortless condition of Jerusalem is the main feature,—here, on the other hand, it is the judgment which the Lord, in His wrath, has decreed against Jerusalem and Judah, that forms the leading thought in the complaint, as is shown by the prominence repeatedly given to the wrath, rage, burning wrath, etc. (ver. 1 ff.). The description of this judgment occupies the first part of the poem (vers. 1-10); then follows, in the second part (vers. 11-19), the lamentation over the impotency of human consolation, and over the scoffing of enemies at the misfortunes of Jerusalem (vers. 11-16). It was the Lord who sent this judgment ; and it is He alone who can give comfort and help in this distress. To Him must the daughter of Zion betake herself with her complaint (vers. 17-19); and this she actually does in the concluding portion (vers. 20-22).

Vers. 1-10. *Description of the judgment.* — Ver. 1. The lamentation opens with sighs for the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple. The first member of the verse contains the general idea that the Lord (יְהֹוָה, the Lord *κατ' εξοχὴν*, very suitably used instead of *יהוָה*) has, in His wrath, enveloped Jerusalem with clouds. This thought is particularized in the two members that follow, and is referred to the overthrow of Jerusalem and the temple. בָּעַם, from בָּאָם (which is *ἀπ.* λεγ.), as a verb, and is probably a denominative from בָּאָם, a cloud), signifies to cover or surround with clouds. בְּאַפְּנֵי does not mean

“with His wrath” (Ewald, Thenins), but “in His wrath,” as is shown by vers. 3, 6, 21, 22. “The daughter of Zion” here means the city of Jerusalem, which in the second member is called “the glory (or ornament) of Israel,” by which we are to understand neither *res Judæorum florentissimæ* in general (Rosenmüller), nor the temple in special, as the “splendid house,” Isa. lxiv. 10 (Michaelis, Vaihinger). Jerusalem is called the glory or ornament of Israel, in the same way as Babylon in Isa. lxiv. 10 is called “the glory of the splendour of the Chaldeans” (Thenins, Gerlach). In the figurative expression, “He cast down from heaven to earth,” we are not to think there is any reference to a thunderbolt which knocks down an object, such as a lofty tower that reaches to heaven (Thenius); “from heaven” implies that what is to be thrown down was in heaven, as has been already remarked by Raschi in his explanation, *postquam sustulisset eos (Judæos) usque ad cælum, eosdem deject in terram*, where we have merely to substitute “Jerusalem” for *eos*, which is too vague. Gerlach has rightly remarked that the expression “cast down from heaven” is to be accounted for by the fact that, in the first member of the verse, Jerusalem is compared to a star, in the same way as Babylon is expressly called a star in Isa. xiv. 12; nay, what is more, Jerusalem is here compared to a star that has fallen from heaven; the reference to that passage thus becomes unmistakeable. Moreover, the casting down from heaven means something more than deprivation of the glory that had come on the city in consequence of God’s dwelling in the midst of it (Gerlach); it signifies, besides, the destruction of the city, viz. that it would be laid in ashes. In all this, the Lord has not been thinking of, *i.e.* paid any regard to, His footstool, *i.e.* the ark of the covenant (1 Chron. xxviii. 2; Ps. xcix. 5),—not the temple (Ewald), although we cannot think of the ark without at the same thinking of the temple as the house in which it was kept. The ark, and not the temple, is named, because the temple became a habitation of the Lord, and a place where He revealed Himself, only through the ark of the covenant, with which the Lord had graciously connected His presence among His people. It is further implied, in the fact that God does not think of His footstool, that the ark itself was destroyed

along with the temple and the city.—Ver. 2. The Lord has destroyed not merely Jerusalem, but the whole kingdom. **עִלָּעַ**, “to swallow up,” involves the idea of utter annihilation, the fury of destruction, just in the same way as it [viz. the fury] is peculiar to **עָבֵרָה**, the overflowing of anger. “He hath not spared” forms an adverbial limitation of the previous statement, “unsparingly.” The *Qeri* **לִילָּא**, instead of **אָלָּא**, is an unnecessary and unpoetic emendation. **כָּלְנָאֹות**, all the pastures of Jacob. According to its etymology, **נִיחָה** means a place where shepherds or nomads rest, or stay, or live; here, it is not to be understood specially of the dwellings as contrasted with, or distinguished from the pasture-grounds, but denotes, in contrast with the fortresses (**מִבְצָרִים**), the open, unfortified places of the country in which men and cattle enjoy food and rest. “The strongholds of the daughter of Judah” are not merely the fortifications of Jerusalem, but the fortresses generally of the country and kingdom of Judah; cf. Jer. v. 17, xxxiv. 7. **חַנֵּעַ לְאַרְצָן**, “to cast down to the ground” (used of the pulling down of walls, cf. Isa. xxv. 12), is an epexegesis of **מִרְסָה**, as in Ex. xiii. 14, and is not to be joined (in opposition to the accents) with what succeeds, and taken figuratively. For neither does **לְלִילָּה** need any strengthening, nor does **חַנֵּעַ לְאַרְצָן** suitably apply to the kingdom and its princes. The desecration of the kingdom consisted in its being dishonoured by the disgraceful conduct of its rulers; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 40.

In vers. 3 and 4, the writer describes the hostile conduct of the Lord towards Israel, by which the kingdom of Judah was destroyed. Thenius utterly mistakes the poetic character of the description given, and evidently finds in it the several events that occurred up to the taking of the city, all mentioned in their natural order; according to this, the perfects would require to be translated as preterites. But this view can be made out only by giving an arbitrary meaning to the several figures used; *e.g.*, it is alleged that “every horn” means the frontier fortresses, that the expression “before the enemy” refers to the time when the latter turned his face against Jerusalem, and so on. The three members of ver. 3 contain a climax: deprivation of the power to resist; the withdrawal of aid; the necessary consequence of which was the burning like a flame of fire. “To

cut down the horn" means to take away offensive and defensive power; see on *Jer. xlvi. 25*. "Every horn" is not the same as "all horns," but means all that was a horn of Israel (Gerlach). This included not merely the fortresses of Judah, but every means of defence and offence belonging to the kingdom, including men fit for war, who are neither to be excluded nor (with Le Clerc) to be all that is understood by "every horn." In the expression יְמִינֵנוּ . . . הַשִּׁבְעָה, the suffix, as in קְשָׁתֵּנוּ, ver. 4, refers to Jahveh, because the suffix joined to יְמִינֵנוּ always points back to the subject of the verb הַשִּׁבְעָה; cf. *Ps. lxxiv. 11*. God drew back His hand before the enemy, *i.e.* He withdrew from the people His assistance in the struggle against the enemy. Such is the meaning given long ago by the Chaldee: *nec auxiliatus est populo suo coram hoste.* וַיִּבְאַר בַּעֲקָב does not mean "He consumed Jacob;" but He burned (*i.e.* made a conflagration) in Jacob; for, in every passage in which בַּעַר is construed with בָּ, it does not mean to "burn something," but to burn in or among, or to kindle a fire (cf. *Job i. 16*, where the burning up is only expressed by וַיַּאֲכַלֵּם, *Nuin. xi. 3*, *Ps. cvi. 18*), or to set something on fire, *Isa. xlvi. 25*. The burning represents devastation; hence the comparison of בַּעַר with "like fire of flame (= flaming, brightly blazing fire, cf. *Isa. iv. 5*, *Ps. cv. 32*) that devours round about." The subject of בַּעַר is Jahveh, not *ira Jovæ* (Rosenmüller), or לְהַבָּה (Neumann), or the enemy (Gerlach). The transition from the perfect with 1 consec. does not cause any change of the subject; this is shown by vers. 4 and 5, where also the second clause is connected with the first by means of 1 consec. But the statement of Gerlach—that if Jahveh and not the enemy be the subject, then the consecutive sentence (the burning among Jacob as the result of the withdrawal of Jahveh's hand before the enemy) would be inexplicable—gives no evidence of its trth. The kindling or making of the fire in Jacob is, of course, represented as a result of what is previously stated, yet not as the consequence merely of the withdrawal of his hand, but also of the cutting off of every horn. In both of these ways, God has kindled in Jacob a fire which grows into a destructive conflagration.—In ver. 4 the idea is still further developed: God not merely delivered up His people to the enemy, leaving them defenceless and help-

less, but also came forward Himself to fight against them as an enemy. He bent His bow like a warrior, showing Himself, in reference to His claims, as an adversary or oppressor. The specification "His right hand" is added, not so much for the purpose of defining more exactly the activity of the right hand (using it to shoot the arrows or wield the sword ; cf. Deut. xxxii. 41 ff., Ps. vii. 13 f.), as rather with the view of expressing more precisely the hostile attitude of God, since the right hand of God is at other times represented as the instrument of help. The expression "and He slew," which follows, does not require us to think of a sword in the right hand of God, since we can also kill with arrows. God slew as an enemy ; He destroyed everything that was precious in men's sight, *i.e.* not merely *omnes homines cætate, specie, dignitate conspicuos* (C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Thenius) ; for, in Ps. lxxviii. 47, חָרָב is also used with reference to the effect of hail on the vine ; and the arrows shot from the bow are merely named by synecdoche, and by way of specification, as instruments of war for destruction. Still less can מִתְמִימִיעַן signify *omnia ea templi ornamenta, quibus merito gloriabatur populus* (Kalkschmidt), since it is not till ver. 6 ff. that the temple is spoken of. "The word is to be taken in its widest generality, which is indicated by 'all,' accordingly, it comprehends everything that can be looked upon as dear," including children (cf. Ezek. xxiv. 25) and the sanctuary, though all these do not exhaust the meaning of the word (Gerlach). Upon the tent of the daughter of Zion He poured out His fury in fire. The daughter of Zion means the inhabitants of Jerusalem : her tent is not the temple (Kalkschmidt, Ewald), which is never called the tent of the daughter of Zion, but only that of Jahveh (1 Kings ii. 28, etc.) ; but her house, *i.e.* the city as a collection of dwellings. The figure of the outpouring of wrath is often used, not only in Jer. vi. 11, x. 25, xlii. 18, etc., but also in Hos. v. 10, Zeph. iii. 8, Ps. lxix. 25, lxxvi. 6, etc.—Ver. 5. The Lord has become like an enemy. פָּנָאָב is not separated from פָּנָה by the accents (Pesik and Mahpak before, and Kadma after) ; so that there appears to be nothing to justify the remark of Gerlach, that, "as if the prophet were hesitating whether he should state explicitly that the Lord had become an enemy, he breaks off the sentence he had begun, 'The Lord hath become

. . . , and continues, ‘He hath destroyed like a mighty one.’” As to בָּלָע, cf. ver. 2. “Israel” is the name of Judah viewed as the covenant people. The swallowing or destruction of Israel is explained in the clauses which follow as a destruction of the palaces and fortresses. The mention of the palaces points to the destruction of Jerusalem, while the “fortresses” similarly indicate the destruction of the strong cities in the country. The interchange of the suffixes תְּ— and וְ— is accounted for on the ground that, when the writer was thinking of the citadels, the city hovered before his mind; and when he regarded the fortresses, the people of Israel similarly presented themselves. The same interchange is found in Hos. viii. 14; the assumption of a textual error, therefore, together with the conjectures based on that assumption, is shown to be untenable. On the expression, “He hath destroyed his strongholds,” cf. Jer. xlvi. 18; on תְּמִימִית וְאַמִּימִית, Isa. xxix. 2: in this latter case, two word-forms derived from the same stem are combined for the sake of emphasis. “Daughter of Judah,” as in ver. 2, cf. i. 15.

In vers. 6 and 7, mention is made of the destruction of the temple and the cessation of public worship. “He treated violently (cruelly),” *i.e.* laid waste, “like a garden, His enclosure.” שָׁבֵשׁ (from שָׁבַשׁ = שָׁבֵשׁ, to intertwine, hedge round) signifies a hedge or enclosure. The context unmistakeably shows that by this we are to understand the temple, or the holy place of the temple; hence שָׁבֵשׁ is not the hedging, but what is hedged in. But the comparison שָׁבֵשׁ has perplexed expositors, and given occasion for all kinds of artificial and untenable explanations. We must not, of course, seek for the point of the comparison in the ease with which a garden or garden-fence may be destroyed, for this does not accord with the employment of the verb שָׁבַשׁ; but the garden is viewed as a pleasure-ground, which its owner, if it does not suit its purpose, destroys or gives up again, without much hesitation. The emphasis lies on the suffix in שְׁבֵשׁ, “*His own* enclosure,” God’s enclosure = the sacred enclosure (Gerlach), the sanctuary protected by Himself, protected by laws intended to keep the sanctity of the temple from profanation. The second clause states the same thing, and merely brings into prominence another aspect of the sanctity of the temple by the employment of the word מָעוֹרֶה. This noun, as here used, does

not mean the “time,” but the “place of meeting;” this is not, however, the place where the people assemble, but the place of meeting of the Lord with His people, where He shows Himself present, and grants His favour to the congregation appearing before Him. Thus, like **מִזְבֵּחַ מֹעֵד אֱלֹהִים**, the word signifies the place where God reveals His gracious presence to His people; cf. Ex. xxv. 22, and the explanation of **נִשְׁעָן** given in that passage. In the first member of the verse, the temple is viewed as a place sacred to God; in the second, as the place where He specially manifests His gracious presence in Israel. With the destruction of the temple, Jehovah (the covenant God) caused feast and Sabbath, *i.e.* all public festivals and divine service, to be forgotten. The destruction of the sacred spots set apart for the worship of the Lord was attended with the cessation of the sacred festivals. Thereby it became evident that the Lord, in His fierce anger, had rejected king and priest. The singulars, festival, Sabbath, king, and priest, are used in unrestricted generality. King and priest are regarded as the divinely chosen media of the covenant graces. The abolition of public worship practically involved that of the priesthood, for the service of the priests was connected with the temple. Expositors are much divided in their views regarding the object for which the king is here mentioned in connection with the priest. There is no special need for refuting the opinion of Thenius, that king and priest are named as the two main factors in the worship of God, because the seat of the king was upon Zion as well as that of the priesthood; for the seat of the priests was as little on Mount Zion as the king’s palace was on the temple mount. Moreover, the words do not treat of the destruction of the royal palace and the dwellings of the priests, but declare that royalty and the priesthood will be rejected. The mention of the king in connection with the priests implies a close connection also of royalty with the temple. Nägelsbach, accordingly, is of opinion that the kings also belong to the number of those summoned to celebrate the feasts, and were not merely Jehovah’s substitutes before the people, but also “representatives of the people before God;” for he adopts the remark of Oehler (in Herzog’s *Real Enc.* viii. S. 12), that “the Israelitish kingdom (especially in David and Solomon) bears a certain

sacerdotal character, inasmuch as the king, at the head of the people and in their name, pays homage to God, and brings back again to the people the blessing of God (2 Sam. vi. 17 ff.; 1 Kings iii. 4, viii. 14 ff., 55 ff., 62 ff., ix. 25; 1 Chron. xxix. 10 ff.; 2 Chron. i. 6, compared with Ezek. xlvi. 1 ff.)." This sacerdotal character of royalty, however, was but the outcome of the sacerdotal character of the people of Israel. In view of this, the king, because of his position as the head of the people in civil matters (for he was *præcipuum ecclesiæ membrum*), fully brought out the relation of the people to the Lord, without, however, discharging any peculiarly sacerdotal function. The complaint in the present verse,—that, with the destruction of the temple, and the abolition of the service connected with it, Jahveh had rejected king and priest,—implies that royalty in Israel stood in as intimate connection with the temple as the priesthood did. This connection, however, is not to be sought for so much in the fact that it was the incumbent duty of the theocratic king, in the name and at the head of the people, to pay homage to God, and to see that the public worship of Jahveh was upheld; we must rather seek for it in the intimate relation instituted by God between the maintenance of the Davidic monarchy and the building of the house of God. This connection is exhibited in the promise made by God to David, when the latter had resolved to build a house for the Lord to dwell in: He (Jahveh) shall build a house to him (David), viz. raise up his seed after him, and establish his kingdom for ever; and this seed of David shall build a house to His name (2 Sam. vii. 12 ff.). This promise, in virtue of which Solomon built the temple as a dwelling for the name of Jahveh, connected the building of the temple so closely with the kingdom of David, that this continued existence of the temple might be taken as a pledge of the continuance of David's house; while the destruction of the temple, together with the abolition of the public ministrations, might, on the other hand, serve as a sign of the rejection of the Davidic monarchy. Viewing the matter in this light, Jeremiah laments that, with the destruction of the temple and the abolition of the public festivals, Jahveh has rejected king and priest, *i.e.* the royal family of David as well as the Levitical priesthood. —In ver. 7, special mention is further made of the rejection of

the altar, and of the sanctuary as the centre of divine worship. The verbs יָנַח and נִיאַר are used in Ps. lxxxix. 39, 40, in connection with the rejection of the Davidic monarchy. "The sanctuary," mentioned in connection with "the altar," does not mean the temple in general, but its inner sanctuary,—the holy place and the most holy place, as the places of worship corresponding to the altar of the fore-court. The temple-building is designated by "the walls of her palaces." For, that by אַרְמָנוֹתֶיהָ we are to understand, not the palaces of the city of David, the royal palaces, but the towering pile of the temple, is unmistakeably evident from the fact that, both before and after, it is the temple that is spoken of,—not its fortifications, the castles specially built for its defence (Thenius); because אַרְמָנוֹן does not mean a fortified building, but (as derived from אָנוֹם, to be high) merely a lofty pile. Such were the buildings of the temple in consequence of their lofty situation on Moriah. In the house of Jahveh, the enemy raises a loud cry (קֹל קָרְבָּן, cf. Jer. xxii. 20), as on a feast-day. The cry is therefore not a war-cry (Pareau, Rosenmüller), but one of jubilee and triumph, as if they had come into the temple to a festival: in Ps. lxxiv. 4, the word used is שָׁׁמֵן, to roar [as a lion].

The lament over the destruction of the kingdom concludes, in vers. 8, 9, by mentioning that the walls of Jerusalem are destroyed; with this the Chaldeans ended the work of demolition. The expression חַשְׁבָּה יְהוָה represents this as the execution of a divine decree,—a turn which forms an appropriate introduction to the close of the work of destruction. Raschi makes the following remark concerning this: *a longo inde tempore, in animum induxerat, hanc urbem vastare secundum illud quod Jer. xxxii. 31 dixit.* This intention He has now carried out. The words, "He stretched out the measuring-line," are more exactly determined by what follows, "He withdrew not His hand from destroying;" this shows the extent to which the destruction was carried out. The measuring-line was drawn out for the purpose of determining the situation and direction of buildings (Job xxxviii. 5; Zech. i. 15); but Jahveh applies it also for the purpose of pulling down buildings (2 Kings xxi. 13; Isa. xxxiv. 11; Amos vii. 7), in order to indicate that He carries out the destruction with the same precision as that of

the builder in finishing his work. The rampart and the wall sorrow over this. **לְחָנָן** (from **לְחָנָה**) is the rampart, *i.e.* the low wall with the ditch, surrounding the fortress outside the city wall; cf. 2 Sam. xx. 15, Isa. xxvi. 1. The gates of the daughter of Zion (*i.e.* of Jerusalem) are sunk into the earth, *i.e.* have been completely buried under rubbish by the demolition, as if they had sunk into the ground. The subject to **אָפָר וְשָׁפָר** is Jahveh. The bars of the daughter of Zion are those with which the city gates were closed, for the protection of the inhabitants. With the destruction of Jerusalem the kingdom of God is destroyed. King and princes are among the heathen,—carried away into exile. It must, indeed, be allowed that **אָנָן תְּרוּמָה** is connected by the accents with what precedes; and Gerlach defends the construction, “they are among the heathen without law,”—not only agreeing with Kalkschmidt in taking **תְּרוּמָה** as a designation of the **בָּנִים** as *ethnici*,—*ad gentes, quibus divina nulla erat revelatio*,—but also with Luther, who translates: “her king and her princes are among the heathen, because they cannot administer the law,” or generally, have it not. But, on the other hand, the accents merely indicate the stichometrical arrangement, not the relation of the words according to their sense; and the remark, “that ver. 9bc sets forth the fate of the persons who stood to the city in the relation of helpers and counsellors or comforters (her king, her prophets), of whose help (counsel, or comfort) the city was deprived, as well as of the external means of defending her” (first member), proves nothing at all, for the simple reason that the priests also belonged to the number of the helpers, counsellors, and comforters of the city; hence, if this were the meaning, and the two halves of the verse were meant to stand in this relation, then the priests would certainly have been mentioned also. The second half of the verse is not connected with the first in the manner supposed by Gerlach; but, from the whole preceding description of the way in which the divine wrath has been manifested against Jerusalem, it draws this conclusion: “Judah has lost its king and its princes, who have been carried away among the heathen: it has also lost the law and prophecy.” “Law” and “vision” are mentioned as both media of divine revelation. The law is the

summary of the rule of life given by God to His people: this exists no more for Judah, because, with the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, the divinely appointed constitution of Israel was abolished and destroyed. Prophecy was the constant witness to the presence of God among His people; by this means the Lord sought to conduct Israel to the object of their election and calling, and to fit them for becoming a holy nation and a kingdom of priests. The perf. נִזְמָן is not a preterite, but the expression of an accomplished fact. The prophets of the daughter of Zion no longer obtain any vision or revelation from Jahveh: the revelation of God by prophets has ceased for Zion. The words imply that there are still prophets, and merely affirm that they do not receive any revelation from God. This is not opposed to the fact that Jeremiah, some months after the destruction of Jernusalem, again received a revelation; cf. Jer. xlvi. 4 with ver. 7. The meaning of the complaint is simply that Jahveh no longer owns His people, no longer gives them a token of His gracious presence, just as it is said in Ps. lxxiv. 9, "There is no more any prophet." But it is not thereby declared that prophecy has altogether and for ever been silenced, but merely that, when Jerusalem was destroyed, Israel received no prophetic communication,—that God the Lord did not then send them a message to comfort and sustain them. The revelation which Jeremiah (xlvi. 7) received regarding the determination of the people who sought to flee to Egypt, has no connection with this at all, for it does not contain a word as to the future destiny of Jerusalem. Hence it cannot be inferred, with Thenius, from the words now before us, that the present poem was composed before that revelation given in Jer. xlvi. 7 ff.; nor yet, with Nägelsbach, that the writer had here before his mind the condition of the great mass of the people who had been carried away into exile. Neither, indeed, were the people in exile without prophetic communications; for, even so early as six years before the overthrow of Jerusalem, God had raised up to the exiles a prophet in the person of Ezekiel.—Ver. 10. The whole of the people have sunk into deep sorrow over this misfortune. The elders, as the counsellors of the city, sit on the ground in silence, from deep sorrow; cf. Job ii. 8, 13, and

regarding the tokens of sorrow, Job ii. 12, Jer. iv. 8, vi. 26, etc. The virgins of Jerusalem have renounced their gaiety and bowed their head, sorrowing, to the ground; cf. i. 4.

Vers. 11–16. The impotence of human comfort, and the mockery of enemies. Ver. 11 f. The misery that has befallen the people is so fearful, that sorrow over it wears out one's life. "Mine eyes pine away because of tears," is the complaint of the prophet, not merely for himself personally, but in the name of all the godly ones. "Mine eyes pine" is the expression used in Ps. lxix. 4. On חַפְרַמְרַת מַעַי, cf. i. 20. The expression, "my liver is poured out on the earth," occurs nowhere else, and is variously explained. That the liver is *fons sanguinis*, and thus the seat of the animal life (Rosenmüller, Thenius), cannot be made out from Prov. vii. 23. This passage rather forms a proof that among the Hebrews, according to a view widely prevalent in ancient times, the liver was considered the seat of sensual desire and lust (cf. Delitzsch's *Bib. Psychology*, Clark's translation, p. 316). But this view is insufficient as an explanation of the passage now before us. Besides, there are no proofs to show that "liver" is used for "heart," or even for "gall," although Job xvi. 13 is unwarrantably adduced in support of this position. A closely related expression, certainly, is found in Job xxx. 16, Ps. xlvi. 5, where the soul is said to be poured out; but the liver is different from נֶפֶשׁ, the principle of the corporeal life. If the liver was called בָּבֶר because, according to Galen, *de usu partium*, vi. 17 (in Gesen. *Thes.* p. 655), *omnium viscerum et densissimum et gravissimum est*, then it may be regarded, instead of עַיִם, as the chief bodily organ through which not merely lust, but also pain, is felt; and the pouring out of the liver on the earth may thus mean that the inner man is dissolved in pain and sorrow,—perishes, as it were, through pain. For it is evident from the context, and universally admitted, that it is the effect of pain in consuming the bodily organs that is here meant to be expressed. שָׁבֵר בַּת עַמִּי is a genuine Jeremianic expression (cf. Jer. vi. 14, viii. 11, 21, etc.), which again occurs in ver. 13, iii. 47, 48, and iv. 10. In what follows, some harrowing details are given regarding the destruction of the daughter of Zion. נְתַעַן for נְהַעַן, while (or because) children and sucklings were pining away on the

streets of the city. This figure of heartrending misery is further carried out in ver. 12, for the purpose of vividly setting forth the terrible distress. Gerlach is wrong in thinking that the writer brings forward such sad scenes as would be likely to present themselves in the period immediately after the destruction of the city. For, the fact that, in ver. 10, the eye of the mourner is directed to the present, is far from being a proof that vers. 11c and 12 also treat of the present; and the imperfect יִשְׁבּוּ, ver. 12, is not parallel in time with יִשְׁבּוּ, ver. 12, but designates the repetition of the action in past time. “The children say to their mothers, Where is corn and wine?” *i.e.* Give us bread and wine, or, Where can we eat and drink? Corn and must (as in Jer. xxxi. 12, etc.) are mentioned as the usual means of nourishment of the Israelites. קְרֵבָה, “corn,” is used poetically for bread (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 24),—not pounded or roasted grain, which was used without further preparation (Thenius), and which is called קְרֵבָה, Lev. xxiii. 14, 1 Sam. xvii. 17, 2 Sam. xvii. 28. The sucklings poured out their soul, *i.e.* breathed out their life, into the bosom of their mothers, *i.e.* hugging their mothers, although these could not give them nourishment; cf. iv. 4.—Ver. 13. Against such terrible misery, human power can give neither comfort nor help. “What shall I testify to you?” The *Kethib* אָעוֹדָה is a mistake in transcription for אָעִידָה (*Qeri*), because עִידָה is not commonly used in the Kal. עִידָה, to bear witness, is mostly construed with בְּ, against or for any one, but also with acc., 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13, *in malam*, and Job xxix. 11, *in bonam partem*. Here it is used in the latter sense: “give testimony to thee” for the purpose of instruction and comfort,—not of a calamity that has happened elsewhere, as Calvin and Thenius explain, though against the construction of the verb with the accus.; still less “to make one swear” (Gesenius, Ewald). That the prophetic witness is meant here in the sense of encouragement by instruction, warning, and comfort, is evident from the mention of the testimony of the false prophets in ver. 14. “What shall I compare to thee?” *i.e.* what kind of misfortune shall I mention as similar to yours? This is required by the principle derived from experience: *solamen miseris socios habuisse malorum.* וְאַנְתָּמָה, “that I may comfort thee.” The reason

assigned, viz. "for thy destruction is great, like the sea" (*i.e.* immense), follows the answer, understood though not expressed, "I can compare nothing to thee." The answer to the last question, "Who can heal thee?" (רַפֵּא with הֲ) is, "no man;" cf. Jer. xxx. 12 ff. Reasons are assigned for this in vers. 14–16. —Ver. 14. From her prophets, Jerusalem can expect neither comfort nor healing. For they have brought this calamity upon her through their careless and foolish prophesying. Those meant are the false prophets, whose conduct Jeremiah frequently denounced; cf. Jer. ii. 8, v. 12, vi. 13 f., viii. 10, xiv. 14 f., xxiii. 17, 32, xxvii. 10, 15. They prophesied vanity, — peace when there was no peace,—and לִפְנֵי, "absurdity," = חַטָּאת, Jer. xxiii. 13. They did not expose the sin and guilt of the people with the view of their amendment and improvement, and thereby removing the misery into which they had fallen by their sin; nor did they endeavour to restore the people to their right relation towards the Lord, upon which their welfare depended, or to avert their being driven into exile. On **הַשִּׁיבָה שִׁבְתָּה**, cf. Jer. xxxii. 44. The meaning of this expression, as there unfolded, applies also to the passage now before us; and the translation, *captivitatem avertere* (Michaelis, Nägelsbach), or to "ward off thy captivity" (Luther, Thenius), is neither capable of vindication nor required by the context. Instead of healing the injuries of the people by discovering their sins, they have seen (prophesied) for them מִשְׁאוֹת, "burdens," *i.e.* utterances of threatening import (not *effata*; see on Jer. xxiii. 33), which contained אַשְׁׁוֹן, "emptiness," and מְהֻחָם, "rejection." The combination of "emptiness" with "burdens" does not prevent the latter word from being applied to threatening oracles; for the threats of the false prophets did not refer to Judah, but were directed against the enemies of Israel. For instance, that they might promise the people speedy deliverance from exile, they placed the downfall of the Chaldean power in immediate prospect; cf. Jer. xxviii. 2–4, 11. מְהֻחָם is ἄπ. λεγ. as a noun, and is also dependent on "burdens" (cf. Ewald, § 289, c): it signifies ejection from the land, not "persecution" (Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Ewald, etc.), for Jeremiah uses נָרָח (in Niph. and Hiph.) always in the sense of rejection, expulsion from the country; and the word has here an unmistakable

reference to Jer. xxvii. 10, 15: "They prophesy lies to you, that they may eject you from your country."—Ver. 15 f. Strangers and enemies have, for the misfortune of Jerusalem, only expressions of scorn and delight over her loss. "Those who pass by the way" are strangers who travel past Jerusalem. To clap the hands together is not here a gesture betokening anger and disinclination (Num. xxiv. 10), but of delight over the injury of others, as in Job xxvii. 23. **שְׁרָק**, to hiss, is an expression of scorn; see on Jer. xix. 8. The same is true as regards the shaking of the head; cf. Ps. xxii. 8, cix. 25, etc.: the expression for this, in Jer. xviii. 16, is **הַנִּיד בְּרָאֵשׁ**. The exclamation, "Is this the city which they call 'perfect in beauty'?" is an expression of scornful astonishment. **כְּלִילַת יְפִי** is substantially the same as **מְכֻלָּל יְפִי**, Ps. l. 2, where the expression is applied to Zion; in Ezek. xxvii. 3 the same is said of Tyre. That Jeremiah had Ps. l. 2 in his mind is shown by the apposition, "a joy of the whole earth," which is taken from Ps. xlvi. 3.—Ver. 16. The enemy in triumph express their joy over the fall of Jerusalem. The opening of the mouth (as in Ps. xxxv. 21, Job xvi. 10), taken in connection with what follows, is also a gesture peculiar to scornful speech. The gnashing of the teeth (Ps. xxxv. 16, xxxvii. 12; Job xvi. 9) is here an expression of rage that has burst out. The object of "we have swallowed" is to be derived from the context ("against thee"), viz. the city of Jerusalem. "Surely this" is a strong asseveration—"this is the very day." The asyndetic collection of the three verbs accords with the impassioned character of the enemy's speech. "To see" is here equivalent to living to see.

Vers. 17-19. In this calamity, which Jahveh has ordained, it is only He who can bring comfort and help; [and this He will do], if earnest and incessant complaint be made to Him regarding the misery. In order to turn the thoughts of the people in this direction, the prophet lays emphasis on the fact that God has now executed this destruction which He has threatened long before, and has prepared for the triumph of the enemy. "Jahveh hath done what He hath purposed," has now performed the word which He has commanded all along from the days of yore. Zechariah (i. 6) also lays this

truth before the heart of his contemporaries. **עֲזַב**, to cut off, is used metaphorically in the sense of finishing, completing, as in Isa. x. 12, Zech. iv. 9. To fulfil a word that has been ordered, signifies to execute it. **מִלְאָה** does not mean to announce, but to command, order; the word has been chosen, not merely with reference to the fact that the threatened rejection of Israel was announced in the law, but also with regard to the circumstance that the threat of punishment for sins is an evidence of the moral government of the world, and the holiness of the Lord and Ruler of the world demands the punishment of every act of rebellion against the government and decrees of God. "The days of old" are the times of Moses; for Jeremiah has before his mind the threatenings of the law, Lev. xxvi. 23 ff., Deut. xxviii. 15 ff. "Without sparing," as Jeremiah (iv. 28) has announced to the people. In the following clause, "He hath made thine enemy rejoice over thee," thoughts are reproduced from Ps. lxxxix. 43. To "exalt the horn" means to grant power and victory; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 1, Ps. lxxv. 5.—Ver. 18. When it is seen that the Lord has appointed the terrible calamity, the people are driven to pray for mercy. Hence ver. 18 follows, yet not at once with the summons to prayer, but with the assertion of the fact that this actually takes place: "their heart cries out unto the Lord;" and it is not till after this that there follows the summons to entreat Him incessantly with tears. The perfect **רֹעֵשׁ** represents the crying as already begun, and reaching on to the present (cf. Ewald, § 135, b), for which we use the present in German [and in English]. That the suffix in "their heart" does not point to the enemies mentioned at the close of ver. 17, but to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, is indubitably evident from what is substantially stated in the clause, viz. that crying to the Lord merely indicates the crying to God for help in distress. There is no sufficient reason for Ewald's change of **רֹעֵשׁ** into **לְבַדְךָ צַעֲקִי**, "outeries of thine heart," i.e. let the cry of thine heart sound forth; still less ground is there for the conjecture of Thenius, that **לְבַדְךָ** should be changed into **לְבַדְךָ**, because this is opposed to the following summons to implore help: other more unnatural changes in the text it were needless to mention. The following clauses,

“O wall of the daughter of Zion,” etc., do not state how her heart has cried and still cries to the Lord, but bid her constantly go on imploring. Several expositors have taken objection to the direct address, “O wall of the daughter of Zion,” and have sought to remove the difficulty by making conjectures. Hence, *e.g.*, Thenius still holds that there is good ground for the objection, saying that there is a wide difference between the poetic expression, “the wall mourns” (ver. 8), and the summons, “O wall, let tears run down.” This difference cannot be denied, yet such personification is not without analogy. A similar summons is found in Isa. xiv. 31: “Howl, O gate” (*porta*). It is self-evident that it is not the wall simply as such that is considered, but everything besides connected with it, so that the wall is named instead of the city with its inhabitants, just as in Isa. xiv. 31 gate and city are synonymous. Hence, also, all the faculties of those residing within the wall (eyes, heart, hands) may be ascribed to it, inasmuch as the idea of the wall easily and naturally glides over into that of the daughter of Zion. The expression, “Let tears run down like a stream,” is a hyperbole used to indicate the exceeding greatness of the grief. “By day and night” is intensified by the clauses which follow: “give not,” *i.e.* grant not. פָוִתָּה לֹא, “torpidity (stagnation) to thyself.” The noun פָוִתָּה is ḥāp. λεγ., like הַפָּגָה, iii. 49; the verb נָבַת, however, occurs in Gen. xxv. 26 and Ps. lxxvii. 3, where it is used of the torpidity of the vital spirits, stagnation of the heart. The expression in the text is a poetic one for פָוִתָּה: “do not permit thy numbness,” *i.e.* let not thy flood of tears dry up; cf. Ewald, § 289, b. עֵינֶיךָ בַת is the eyeball, not the tears (Pareau); cf. Ps. xvii. 8. מִתְלָדָם comes from מִתְלָדָם, to be still, as in Jer. xlvi. 6. On the thought here presented, cf. Jer. xiv. 17.—Ver. 19. בָּרַע (prop. to raise a whining cry, but commonly “to shout for joy”) here means to weep aloud, lament. רָאשׁ אֲשֶׁר, at the beginning of the night-watches (cf. Judg. vii. 19); not “in the first night-watch” (Kalkschmidt, following Bochart and Nägelsbach), but at the beginning of each night-watch, *i.e.* throughout the night; cf. Ps. lxiii. 7. “Pour out thine heart like water before the face of the Lord,” *i.e.* utter the sorrow of thine heart in tears to the Lord. The uplifting of the hands is a gesture indicative of

prayer and entreaty (cf. Ps. xxviii. 2, lxiii. 5, etc.), not “of the deepest distress” (Thenius). **עַל נֶפֶשׁ עַל־בָּנֶיךָ** does not mean *pro vita parvolorum tuorum*, that God may at least preserve them (Rosenmüller, Gerlach), but “on account of the soul of thy children,” which is more distinctly stated, in the following relative sentence, to mean that they have breathed out their soul through hunger. On this matter, cf. ver. 11 and the exposition of that verse. Ewald has placed the last member of the verse within parentheses, as an interpolation, on the ground that a fourth member offends against the law observed in these verses; on the other hand, Thenius is of opinion that the words do not form a member of the verse by themselves, but are a mere prolongation of the third, “because the conclusion of the prophet’s address, begun in ver. 19, was certainly intended to be a complete finish.” But the deviation from the rule is not thereby accounted for. Inasmuch as the words are essential to the expression of the thought, we must simply acknowledge the irregularity, and not arbitrarily cast suspicion on the genuineness of the words.

Vers. 20–22. In ver. 20 follows the prayer which the city has been commanded to make. The prayer sets before the mind of the Lord the terrible misery under which Jerusalem suffers. The question, “To whom hast Thou acted thus?” does not mean, “What innocent and godly ones are being sacrificed?” (Thenius), but “to what nation?”—not a heathen one, but the people of Thy choice, to whom all Thy blessed promises have been given (Nägelsbach). This is clear from the reasons given in the question, in which the murder of the priests and prophets in the sanctuary of the Lord is brought forward. But first there is mentioned a case of inhuman conduct, prompted by necessity, viz. that women, in the extreme destitution of hunger, have been constrained to eat the fruit of their body, their beloved children. **מִן...מִן** does not, in this case, introduce a disjunctive question, but merely an indirect question in two parts. In view of such inhuman cruelties and such desecration of His sanctuary, God cannot remain inactive. The meaning of the question is not: *estne hoc unquam fundo auditum, quod apud nos factum est*, or, *quod matres fame eo adactae fuerint, ut suos fœtus comedenter* (C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller).

For in this case, not the imperfect, but the perfect, would be used. It is merely asked whether something could happen in a certain way, while it is implied that it has actually occurred already. פְּרִיּוּם has the masc. instead of the fem. suffix, as pretty frequently happens. The fruit of their bodies is meant, as the LXX. have rightly rendered; but there is no reason for making this the ground of alterations in the text. The expression “their fruit,” indefinite in itself, is immediately rendered definite by עַלְלִי טְפַחִים (ver. 22), which again is a denominative from טְפַח, and means to bear on the hands, to care for tenderly. Both words occur only in this passage. The Israelites, moreover, had been threatened with this inhuman outrage as the most extreme form of divine chastisement, Lev. xxvi. 26, Deut. xxviii. 56; cf. Jer. xix. 9. While this abomination is opposed to the moral order of the world instituted by God, the other case (the murder of the priests and prophets in the sanctuary) is a violation of the covenant-order which the Lord had given His people. Neither of these arrangements can God consent to abolish. Therein is implicitly contained the request that He would put an end to the misery into which His people have fallen. This request, however, is not expressly stated; there is merely complaint made to God regarding the terrible misery. From the massacre in the temple, the lamentation passes to the bloodshed on the streets of the city, in which neither age nor sex was spared; cf. Jer. vi. 11. חַצְוֹת is a local accus., “through the streets,” along the streets.—Ver. 22. The imperf. תִּקְרֹא has perhaps been chosen merely for the sake of the alphabetic arrangement, because the description is still continued, and the idea of custom (wont) or repetition is not very suitable in the present instance. “Thou summonest, as for a feast-day (viz. for the enemy, cf. i. 15), all my terrors round about.” מְנִיעִי מְפִיבִּים is to be explained in conformity with the formula מְנִיעִי מְפִיבִּים, so frequent in Jeremiah (vi. 25, xx. 4, 10, etc.): מְנִיעִי is therefore to be derived from מְנִיעָה, but not to be confined in its reference to the enemy (as in the Vulgate, *qui terrent*); it is rather to be understood as applying to all the terrible powers that had come upon Judah,—sword, famine, plagues (cf. i. 20). On the ground that מְנִיעִים elsewhere means

wandering, pilgrimage, and that, moreover, the sing. מִנּוּר in Ps. lv. 16 signifies a dwelling, Ewald translates the expression in the text, "my hamlets round about," understanding by that the inhabitants of the defenceless country towns and villages, which stand to the capital that gave them its protection in the relation of settlers in its neighbourhood (LXX. πάροικοι). According to this view, the verse alludes to an important event which took place in those days of the siege, when all the inhabitants of the country towns fled to the capital, thinking that a great festival was going to be held there, as on former occasions; but this became at last for them the great festival of death, when the city was taken. But the translation of the LXX. is of no authority, since they have given a false rendering of מִנּוּר קָפְבִּיב also; and the whole explanation is so artificial and unnatural, that it needs no further refutation. Raschi, indeed, had previously explained מִנּוּר to mean שְׁכִינִי, *vicinos meos*, but added *improbos*, *ut sese congregarent adversus me ad perendum*. Notwithstanding this, מִנּוּר, "wandering" and "place of sojourn," cannot denote the country towns as distinguished from the capital; nor can the flight of the inhabitants of the low-lying regions into the capital be fitly called a summoning together of them by the Lord. The combination פָּלִיט יְשִׁירֵיד is used as in Jer. xlii. 17, xliv. 14. For בְּפֵח, see on ver. 20. With the complaint that no one could escape the judgment,—that the enemy dared to murder even the children whom she [Jerusalem] had carefully nourished and brought up,—the poem concludes, like the first, with deep sorrow, regarding which all attempts at comfort are quite unavailing (Gerlach).

CHAP. III.—THE SUFFERING AND THE CONSOLATION OF THE GOSPEL.

- 1 I [am] the man [that] have seen affliction by the rod of His wrath.
- 2 Me hath He led, and brought [through] darkness, and not light.
- 3 Only against me He repeatedly turneth His hand all the day.
- 4 He hath wasted away my flesh and my skin; He hath broken my bones.
- 5 He buildeth up round about me poison and toil.
- 6 He maketh me sit down in dark places, like those for ever dead.
- 7 He hath hedged me about, so that I cannot get out; He hath made heavy my chain.

8 Moreover, when I cry and shout, He obstructeth my prayer.
 9 He hath walled round my ways with hewn stone, He hath subverted my paths.
 10 He is to me [like] a bear lying in wait, a lion in secret places.
 11 He removeth my ways, and teareth me in pieces ; He maketh me desolate.
 12 He bendeth His bow, and setteth me up as the mark for the arrow.
 13 He causeth the sons of His quiver to go into my reins.
 14 I am become a derision to all my people, their [subject of] satire all the day.
 15 He filleth me with bitterness, maketh me drink wormwood.
 16 And He grindeth my teeth on gravel, He covereth me with ashes.
 17 And my soul hath become despised by prosperity ; I have forgotten . [what] good [is].
 18 And I said, My vital power is gone, and my hope from Jahveh.
 19 Remember my misery and my persecution, wormwood and poison.
 20 My soul remembereth [them] indeed, and sinketh down in me.
 21 This I bring back to my mind, therefore have I hope.
 22 [It is a sign of] the mercies of Jahveh that we are not consumed, for His compassions fail not ;
 23 [They are] new every morning : great is Thy faithfulness.
 24 Jahveh [is] my portion, saith my soul ; therefore I hope in Him.
 25 Jahveh is good unto those who wait for Him, to a soul [that] seeketh Him.
 26 It is good that [one] should wait, and that in silence, for the salvation of Jahveh.
 27 It is good for man that he should bear a yoke in his youth.
 28 Let him sit solitary and be silent, for [God] hath laid [the burden] on him.
 29 Let him put his mouth in the dust ; perhaps there is [still] hope.
 30 Let him give [his] cheek to him that smites him, let him be filled with reproach.
 31 Because the Lord will not cast off for ever :
 32 For, though He causeth grief, He also pities, according to the multitude of His mercies.
 33 For He doth not afflict from His heart, and grieve the children of men.
 34 To the crushing all the prisoners of the earth under one's feet,
 35 To the setting aside of a man's rights before the face of the Most High,
 36 To the overthrowing of a man in his cause :—doth not the Lord look [to such doings as these] ?
 37 Who hath spoken, and it was done, [which] the Lord commanded not ?
 38 Doth not evil and good come out of the mouth of Jahveh ?
 39 Why doth a man complain [because] he liveth ? [Let every] man [rather lament] because of his sins.
 40 Let us search and examine our ways, and let us return to Jahveh.
 41 Let us lift up our heart to [our] hands towards God in the heavens.
 42 We have transgressed and rebelled, *Thou* hast not pardoned.

43 Thou didst cover [Thyself] with anger, and didst persecute us; Thou hast slain, Thou hast not pitied.¹

44 Thou didst cover Thyself with a cloud, so that prayer could not pass through.

45 Thou didst make us [like] offscourings and refuse in the midst of the nations.

46 All our enemies have opened their mouths against us.

47 Terror and a snare are ours, destruction and ruin.

48 Mine eye runneth down [with] streams of water, because of the ruin of the daughter of my people.

49 Mine eye poureth itself forth, and ceaseth not, so that there are no stoppings,

50 Until Jahveh shall look down and behold from heaven.

51 Mine eye causeth pain to my soul, because of all the daughters of my city.²

52 Mine enemies closely pursued me, like a bird, without cause.

53 They were for destroying my life in the pit, and cast a stone on me.

54 Waters overflowed over my head; I said, I am cut off.

55 I called on Thy name, O Jahveh, out of the lowest dungeon.

56 Thou hast heard my voice; hide not Thine ear at my sighing, at my cry.

57 Thou art near in the day [when] I call on Thee; Thou sayest, Fear not.

58 Thou hast defended, O Lord, my soul; Thou hast redeemed my life.

59 Thou hast seen, O Jahveh, mine oppression; judge my cause.

60 Thou hast seen all their vengeance, all their projects against me.

61 Thou hast heard their reproach, O Jahveh, all their projects against me;

62 The lips of those who rise up against me, and their meditation against me all the day.

63 Behold their sitting down and their rising up: I am their satire.

64 Thou shalt return a recompense to them, O Jahveh, according to the work of their hands.

65 Thou shalt give to them blindness of heart,—Thy curse to them.

66 Thou shalt pursue [them] in anger, and destroy them from under the heavens of Jahveh.

The two preceding poems ended with sorrowful complaint. This third poem begins with the complaint of a man over

¹ In the latter part of this verse, Keil has written *mitten unter den Völkern*, which is also (correctly) given as the rendering of the second part of ver. 45. This obvious inadvertence has been rectified in the English translation.—TR.

² Keil has here misread the Hebrew text, and translated “my people” (בָּנָי) instead of “my city” (בָּנָי).—TR.

grievous personal suffering. Regarding the contents of this poem, and its relation to the two which precede, Ewald makes the following excellent remarks: "In consequence of experiences most peculiarly his own, the individual may indeed at first make complaint, in such a way that, as here, still deeper despair for the third time begins (vers. 1-18); but, by the deepest meditation for himself on the eternal relation of God to men, he may also very readily come to the due acknowledgment of his own sins and the necessity for repentance, and thereby also to believing prayer. Who is this individual that complains, and thinks, and entreats in this fashion, whose *I* passes unobserved, but quite appropriately, into *we*? O man, it is the very image of thyself! Every one must now speak and think as he does. Thus it is just by this address, which commences in the most doleful tones, that sorrow for the first time, and imperceptibly, has passed into true prayer." This remark contains both the deepest truth and the key to the proper understanding of the contents of this poem, and its position in the middle of the Lamentations. Both of these points have been mistaken by expositors, who (*e.g.* C. B. Michaelis, Pareau, Maurer, Kalkschmidt, and Bleek in his *Introduction*) are of opinion that the writer here makes his personal sufferings the subject of complaint. This cannot be made out, either from ver. 14 or from the description given in ver. 53 ff.: the reverse rather is shown by the fact that, in vers. 22 and 40-47, *we* is used instead of *I*; from which it is evident that the prophet, in the remainder of the poem, is not speaking of himself, or bewailing his own personal sufferings. The confession found in ver. 42, "We have transgressed and rebelled, Thou hast not pardoned," etc., necessarily presupposes not only that the dealing of God towards the sinful and apostate nation, as described in ver. 42 ff., stands in the closest connection with the sufferings of which the prophet complains in vers. 1-18, but also that the chastisement, by means of God's wrath, which was experienced by the man who utters his complaint in vers. 1-18, is identical with the anger which, according to ver. 43, discharged itself on the people; hence the suffering of the individual, which is described in vers. 1-18, is to be regarded as the reflex of but a special instance of the suffering endured by the whole community. Perhaps this

was the view of Aben Ezra, when he says that, in this lamentation, it is individual Israelites who speak ; and most expositors acknowledge that the prophet pours forth his lamentations and his prayers in the name of the godly.

The poem begins by setting forth the grievous soul-sufferings of the godly in their cheerless and hopeless misery (vers. 1-18); then it ascends, through meditation upon the compassion and almighty providence of God, to hope (vers. 19-39), and thus attains to the recognition of God's justice in sending the punishment, which, however, is so intensified through the malice of enemies, that the Lord cannot pass by the attempt to crush His people (vers. 40-54). This reliance on the justice of God impels to prayer, in which there is manifested confidence that God will send help, and take vengeance on the enemy (vers. 55-66).

Vers. 1-18. Lamentation over grievous sufferings. The author of these sufferings is not, indeed, expressly named in the whole section, but it is unmistakeably signified that God is meant ; moreover, at the end of ver. 18 the name יהה is mentioned. The view thus given of the sufferings shows, not merely that he who utters the complaint perceives in these sufferings a chastisement by God, but also that this chastisement has become for him a soul-struggle, in which he may not take the name of God into his mouth ; and only after he has given vent in lamentations to the deep sorrow of his soul, does his spirit get peace to mention the name of the Lord, and make complaint to Him of his need. Nothing certain can be inferred from the lamentations themselves regarding the person who makes complaint. It does not follow from vers. 1-3 that he was burdened with sorrows more than every one else ; nor from ver. 14 that he was a personage well known to all the people, so that one could recognise the prophet in him. As little are they sufferings which Jeremiah has endured alone, and for his own sake, but sufferings such as many godly people of his time have undergone and struggled through. Against the Jeremianic authorship of the poem, therefore, no argument can be drawn from the fact that the personality of him who utters the complaint is concealed.

Ver. 1 ff. In the complaint, "I am the man that saw (*i.e.* lived to see) misery," the misery is not specified ; and we can-

not, with Rosenmüller, refer עַנִּי (without the article) to the misery announced by the prophet long before. “The rod of His wrath,” as in Prov. xxii. 8, is the rod of God’s anger; cf. Job xxi. 9, ix. 34, Isa. x. 5, etc. The suffix in עַבְרָתָו is not to be referred, with Aben Ezra, to the enemy.—Ver. 2. “Me hath He (God) led and brought through darkness (עַמְּךָ, local accus.), and not light,” is a combination like that in Job xii. 25 and Amos v. 18. The path of Jeremiah’s life certainly lay through darkness, but was not wholly devoid of light, because God had promised him His protection for the discharge of his official functions. The complaint applies to all the godly, to whom, at the fall of Jerusalem, no light appeared to cheer the darkness of life’s pathway.—Ver. 3. “Only upon (against) me does He repeatedly turn His hand.” שָׁבֵךְ is subordinated to the idea of עַמְּךָ in an adverbial sense; cf. Gesenius, § 142, 3, b. “His hand” is the smiting hand of God. עַל, “only upon me,” expresses the feeling which makes him on whom grievous sufferings have fallen to regard himself as one smitten in a special manner by God. “The whole day,” i.e. continually; cf. i. 13.—From ver. 4 onwards this divine chastisement is more minutely set forth under various figures, and first of all as a wasting away of the vital force. בָּלַח means to wear out by rubbing, cause to fall away, from בָּלַח, to be worn out, which is applied to clothes, and then transferred to bodies, Job xiii. 28, Ps. xlix. 15. “Flesh and skin” are the exterior and soft constituents of the body, while the bones are the firmer parts. Skin, flesh, and bones together, make up the substance of the human body. Prov. v. 11 forms the foundation of the first clause. “He hath broken my bones” is a reminiscence from the lamentation of Hezekiah in Isa. xxxviii. 13; cf. Ps. li. 10, Job xxx. 17. The meaning is thus excellently given by Pareau: *indicantur animi, fortius iræ divinæ malorumque sensu conquassati, angores.*—The figure in ver. 5, “He builds round about and encircles me,” is derived from the enclosing of a city by besieging it. עַלְיָה is to be repeated after עַמְּךָ. The besieging forces, which encompass him so that he cannot go out and in, are עַמְּךָ וְאַשְׁר. That the former of these two words cannot mean κεφαλήν μου (LXX.), is abundantly evident. שְׁרָא or שְׁרָשָׁא is a plant with a very bitter taste, hence a poisonous plant; see

on Jer. viii. 14. As in that passage מִ רְאֵשׁ, so here the simple שְׁאֵשׁ is an emblem of bitter suffering. The combination with חֲלֹאָה, “toil,” is remarkable, as a case in which a figurative is joined with a literal expression; this, however, does not justify the change of חֲלֹאָה into לְעָנָה (Castell, Schleussner, etc.). The combination is to be explained on the ground that שְׁאֵשׁ had become so common a symbol of bitter suffering, that the figure was quite lost sight of behind the thing signified.—Ver. 6 is a *verbatim* reminiscence from Ps. cxlii. 3c. מִחְשָׁפִים is the darkness of the grave and of Sheol; cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 7. מֵתִים עֲלָמִים does not mean “the dead of antiquity” (Rosenmüller, Maurer, Ewald, Thenius, etc.), but, as in Ps. cxlii. 3, those eternally dead, who lie in the long night of death, from which there is no return into this life. In opposition to the explanation *dudum mortui*, Gerlach fittingly remarks, that “it makes no difference whether they have been dead long ago or only recently, inasmuch as those dead and buried a short time ago lie in darkness equally with those who have long been dead;” while it avails nothing to point to Ps. lxxxviii. 5-7, as Nägelsbach does, since the special subject there treated of is not those who have *long* been dead.—Ver. 7. God has hedged him round like a prisoner, cut off all communication from without, so that he cannot escape, and He has loaded him with heavy chains. This figure is based on Job xix. 8 and Hos. ii. 8. פְּרַד בָּעֵרִי, “He hath made an hedge round me,” does not suggest prison walls, but merely seclusion within a confined space, where he is deprived of free exit. “I cannot go out,” as in Ps. lxxxviii. 9. The seclusion is increased by fetters which are placed on the prisoner. נְחַשָּׁת, “brass,” for fetters, as in German [and English], “irons,” for iron chains.—Ver. 8. This distress presses upon him all the more heavily, because, in addition to this, the Lord does not listen to his prayer and cries, but has rather closed His ear; cf. Jer. vii. 16, Ps. xviii. 42, etc. שְׁתַם for סְתַם (only written here with ו), to stop the prayer; *i.e.* not to prevent the prayer from issuing out of the breast, to restrain supplication, but to prevent the prayer from reaching His ear; cf. ver. 44 and Prov. i. 28.

In ver. 9, the idea of prevention from freedom of action is further carried out on a new side. “He hath walled in my paths with hewn stones.” אָבִנִי נְוִית = נְוִית, 1 Kings v. 31, are

hewn stones of considerable size, employed for making a very strong wall. The meaning is : He has raised up insurmountable obstacles in the pathway of my life. " My paths hath He turned," *i.e.* rendered such that I cannot walk in them. עָזָה is to turn, in the sense of destroying, as in Isa. xxiv. 1, not *contortas fecit* (Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Kalkschmidt), nor *per viam tortuosam ire cogor* (Raschi) ; for the prophet does not mean to say (as Nägelsbach imagines), " that he has been compelled to walk in wrong and tortuous ways," but he means that God has rendered it impossible for him to proceed further in his path ; cf. Job xxx. 13. But we are not in this to think of the levelling of a raised road, as Thenius does ; for נַתְבָּה does not mean a road formed by the deposition of rubbish, like a mound, but a footpath, formed by constant treading (Gerlach).—Ver. 10. Not merely, however, has God cut off every way of escape for him who here utters the complaint, but He pursues him in every possible way, that He may utterly destroy him. On the figure of a bear lying in wait, cf. Hos. xiii. 8, Amos v. 19. It is more usual to find enemies compared to lions in ambush ; cf. Ps. x. 19, xvii. 12. The last-named passage seems to have been present to the writer's mind. The prophets frequently compare enemies to lions, *e.g.* Jer. v. 6, iv. 7, xlix. 19, l. 44.—In ver. 11 the figure of the lion is discontinued ; for בָּרְבִּי סֹעֵר cannot be said of a beast. The verb here is not to be derived from סָרַר, to be refractory, but is the Pilel of סָאַר, to go aside, deviate, make to draw back. To " make ways turn aside" may signify to make a person lose the right road, but not to drag back from the road (Thenius) ; it rather means to mislead, or even *facere ut deficiant viæ*, to take away the road, so that one cannot escape. נַפְפָה is ἄπ. λεγ. in Hebrew ; in Aramean it means to cut or tear in pieces : cf. [the Targum on] 1 Sam. xv. 33, " Samuel נַפְפָה Agag," hewed him in pieces ; and on Ps. vii. 3, where the word is used for the Heb. בָּרְקָה, to tear in pieces (of a lion) ; here it signifies to tear away (limbs from the body, boughs from trees). This meaning is required by the context ; for the following expression, שָׁמְנִי שׂוֹתָם, does not lead us to think of tearing in pieces, lacerating, but *discerpere*, plucking or pulling to pieces. For שׂוֹתָם, see on i. 13, 16.—Ver. 12. " He hath bent His bow," as in ii. 4. The second member, " He hath made me the mark

for His arrows," is taken almost *verbatim* from Job xvi. 12. The arrows are the ills and sorrows appointed by God; cf. Deut. xxxii. 23, Ps. xxxviii. 3, Job vi. 4.—Ver. 14. "Abused in this way, he is the object of scoffing and mockery" (Gerlach). In the first clause, the complaint of Jeremiah in xx. 7 is reproduced. Rosenmüller, Ewald, and Thenius are inclined to take עֲבָדָי as an abbreviated form of the plur. עֲבָדָּי, presuming that the subject of the complaint is the people of Israel. But in none of the three passages in which Ewald (*Gram.* § 177, *a*), following the Masoretes, is ready to recognise such a plural-ending, does there seem any need or real foundation for the assumption. Besides this passage, the others are 2 Sam. xxii. 44 and Ps. cxliv. 2. In these last two cases עֲבָדָי gives a suitable enough meaning as a singular (see the expositions of these passages); and in this verse, as Gerlach has already remarked, against Rosenmüller, neither the conjoined כל nor the plural suffix of נִנְיָתָם requires us to take עֲבָדָי as a plural, the former objection being removed on a comparison of Gen. xli. 10, and the latter when we consider the possibility of a *constructio ad sensum* in the case of the collective עָבָד. But the assumption that here the people are speaking, or that the poet (prophet) is complaining of the sufferings of the people in their name, is opposed by the fact that הנֶּבֶר stands at the beginning of this lamentation, ver. 1. If, however, the prophet complained in the name of each individual among God's people, he could not set up כל-עֲבָדָי in opposition to them, because by that very expression the scoffing is limited to the great body of the people. The Chaldee, accordingly, is substantially correct in its paraphrase, *omnibus protervis populi mei* (following Dan. xi. 14). But that the mass of the people were not subdued by suffering, and that there was a great number of those who would not recognise the chastening hand of God in the fall of the kingdom, and who scoffed at the warnings of the prophets, is evinced, not merely by the history of the period immediately after the destruction of Jerusalem (Jer. xli. ff.), and by the conduct of Ishmael and his followers (Jer. xli. 2 ff.), and of the insolent men who marched to Egypt in spite of Jeremiah's warning (xlivi. 2), but also by the spirit that prevailed among the exiles, and against which Ezekiel had to contend; cf. e.g. Ezek. xii.

22. נִנְיָנְתִּם is a reminiscence from Job xxx. 9; cf. Ps. lxix. 13. —Ver. 15. “He fills me with bitternesses” is a reminiscence from Job ix. 18, only מִמְרֹזִים being exchanged for מִרְזָרִים. Of these two forms, the first occurs only in Job, *l.c.*; the latter denotes, in Ex. xii. 8 and Num. ix. 11, “bitter herbs,” but here “bitternesses.” The reality (viz. bitter sorrow) is what Jeremiah threatens the people with in ix. 14, xxiii. 15. The figure employed in ver. 16 is still stronger. “He made my teeth be ground down on gravel.” צַדְצָה means a gravel stone, gravel, Prov. xx. 17. רָסֶה (which occurs only in Ps. cxix. 20 as well as here, and is allied to רָשֶׁת, from which comes רָשָׁשׁ, something crushed, Lev. ii. 14, 16) signifies to be ground down, and in Hiphil to grind down, *not* to cause to grind; hence בְּחַצְצָה cannot be taken as a second object, “He made my teeth grind gravel” (Ewald); but the words simply mean, “He ground my teeth on the gravel,” *i.e.* He made them grind away on the gravel. As regards the application of the words, we cannot follow the older expositors in thinking of bread mixed with stones, but must view the giving of stones for bread as referring to cruel treatment. The LXX. have rendered הַבְּשִׁישָׁנִי by ἐψώμισέν με σποδόν, the Vulgate by *cibavit me cinere*. This translation has not been lexically established, but is a mere conjecture from Ps. cii. 10. The ἀπ. λεγ. בְּפַשְׁת is allied with בְּבַשׁ, *subigere*, and means in Rabbinic, *deprimere*; cf. Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* *s.v.* Similarly, the Chaldee had previously explained the words to mean *humiliavit* (עִינָה) *me in cinere*; and Raschi, בְּפַה *inclinavit s. subegit me*. Luther follows these in his rendering, “He rolls me in the ashes,” which is a figure signifying the deepest disgrace and humiliation, or a hyperbolical expression for sprinkling with ashes (Ezek. xxvii. 30), as a token of descent into the depths of sorrow.

In vers. 17 and 18 the speaker, in his lamentation, gives expression to that disposition of his heart which has been produced by the misery that has befallen him to so fearful an extent. He has quite given up hopes of attaining safety and prosperity, and his hope in the Lord is gone. In ver. 17 it is a question whether הַנְּתִין is second or third pers. of the imperf. Following the LXX., who give the rendering ἀπώσατο ἐξ εἰρήνης ψυχήν μου, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, De Wette, and Nägelsbach con-

sider **תִּנְתַּחַת** transitive, as in ii. 7, and take **תִּנְתַּחַת** as of the second pers.: "Thou didst reject my soul (me) from peace." But to this view of the words there is the decided objection, that neither before nor after is there any direct address to Jahveh, and that the verbs which immediately follow stand in the first person, and succeed the first clause appropriately enough, provided we take **נַפְשִׁי** as the subject to **תִּנְתַּחַת** (third pers.). **תִּנְתַּחַת** has both a transitive and an intransitive meaning in Kal; cf. Hos. viii. 3 (trans.) and viii. 5 (intrans.). Nägelsbach has no ground for casting doubt on the intrans. meaning in Hos. viii. 5. Moreover, the objection that the passage now before us is a quotation from Ps. lxxxviii. 15 (Nägelsbach) does not prove that **תִּנְתַּחַת נַפְשִׁי** is to be taken in the same sense here as in that passage: "O Jahveh, Thou despisest my soul." By adding **מִשְׁׁלָוִם**, Jeremiah has made an independent reproduction of that passage in the Psalms, if he had it before his mind. This addition does not permit of our attaching a transitive sense to **תִּנְתַּחַת**, for the verb means to despise, not to reject; hence we cannot render the words, "Thou didst reject my soul from peace." The meaning of the clause is not "my soul loathes prosperity," as it is rendered by Thenius, who further gives the sense as follows: "I had such a thorough disgust for life, that I had no longer the least desire for prosperity." As Gerlach has already remarked, this explanation neither harmonizes with the meaning of **מִשְׁׁלָוִם**, nor with the expression of doubt in the following verse, which implies a very lively "sense of the prosperous;" moreover, it has no good lexical basis. The fundamental meaning of **תִּנְתַּחַת** is to stink, be rancid, from which comes the metaphorical one of instilling disgust,—*not*, feeling disgust (Hos. viii. 5),—and further, that of despising. The meaning "to instil disgust" does not suit this passage, but only that of being despised. "My soul is despised of prosperity," *i.e.* so that it shares not in prosperity; with this accords the intransitive use of the Hiphil **תִּנְתַּחַת** with **לֹא**, 2 Chron. xi. 14. The Vulgate, which does not catch the idea of **תִּנְתַּחַת** so exactly, renders the passage by *expulsa est a pace anima mea*. To this there are appropriately joined the words, "I have forgotten good" (good fortune), because I constantly experience nothing but misfortune; and not less appropriate is the expression of doubt, "I say (*i.e.* I think)

my strength and my hope from Jahveh is gone (vanished)," i.e. my strength is worn out through suffering, and I have nothing more to hope for from Jahveh. Starting from the fundamental idea of stability, permanence, **חַזָּקָה**, according to the traditional explanation, means *vigor*, strength; then, by a metaphor, *vis vitalis*, Isa. lxiii. 3, 6,—not trust (Rosenmüller, Thenius, Nägelsbach, etc.), in support of which we are pointed to 1 Sam. xv. 29, but without sufficient reason; see Delitzsch on Isaiah, *l.c.* The complaint here attains its deepest and worst. The complainant in his thoughts has gone far from God, and is on the very verge of despair. But here also begins the turning-point. When for the first time he utters the name of God in the expression "my hope from Jahveh," he shows that Jahveh is to him also still the ground of hope and trust. Hence also he not merely complains, "my strength is gone," etc., but introduces this thought with the words **וַיֹּאמֶר**, "I said," *sc. in my heart, i.e. I thought*, "my strength is gone, and my hope from Jahveh lost," *i.e. vanished*. The mention of the name *Jahveh*, *i.e. the Covenant-God*, keeps him from sinking into despair, and urges him not to let go his trust on the Lord, so that he can now (in what follows) complain to the Lord of his state of distress, and beseech His help.

Vers. 19-39. Consideration of God's compassion and His omnipotence as displayed at critical junctures in the affairs of men. C. B. Michaelis has correctly perceived, and thus set forth, the transition from the complaint, bordering on despair, to hope, as given in ver. 19: *luctatur hic contra desperationis affectum, quo tentatus fuerat, ver. 18, mox inde per fidem emersurus.* In like manner it is said in the *Berleburger Bibel*, "In ver. 19 he struggles with despair, to which he had been tempted, and in the following verse soars up once more into the region of faith." By the resumption of **עַנִּי** from ver. 1, and of **לָעַנְתָּה** and **רָאשָׁה** from vers. 15 and 5, the contents of the whole preceding lamentation are given in a summary, and by **כָּבֵר** are presented to God in prayer. "Mine affliction" is intensified by the addition of "my persecution" (see on i. 7), and the contents of the lamentation thereby more plainly pointed out. This connection of the verse has been misunderstood in many ways. An old interpretation of the words, still maintained by

Böttcher and Thenius, makes יִכְרֶת an infinitive; according to this view, ver. 19 would require to be conjoined with the preceding, and the inf. without יִ would stand for the ground, *recordando*, "while I think of,"—which is grammatically impossible.¹ The same remark applies to the assumption that יִכְרֶת is an infinitive which is resumed in ver. 20: "it thinks of my misery . . . yes, my soul thinks thereon" (Böttcher, Thenius). Gerlach very properly remarks concerning this view that such a construction is unexampled, and, as regards the change in the form of the infinitive (constr. and abs.), would be unintelligible. The objection of Thenius, however, that the imperative meaning usually attached to יִכְרֶת is against the whole context, and quite inappropriate here, is connected with the erroneous assumption that vers. 19 and 20 form a continuation of what precedes, and that the idea of the speaker's being completely overwhelmed by the thought of all that he had suffered and still suffers, forms the proper conclusion of the first part, after which, from ver. 21 onwards, there follows relief. Gerlach has rightly opposed to these arguments the following considerations: (1) That, after the outburst of despair in ver. 18, "my strength is gone, and my hope from Jahveh," the words "my soul is bowed down in me" form far too feeble a conclusion; (2) That it is undoubtedly more correct to make the relief begin with a prayer breathed out through sighs (ver. 19), than with such a reflection as is expressed in ver. 21 ff. Ewald also is right in taking יִכְרֶת as an imperative, but is mistaken in the notion that the speaker addresses any one who is ready to hear him; this view is shown to be erroneous by the simple fact that, in what precedes and succeeds, the thoughts of the speaker are directed to God only.—Ver. 20. The view taken of this verse will depend on the answer to the question whether יִתְּהַלֵּל is second or third pers. fem. Following

¹ Seb. Münster long since said: *Secundum quosdam est יִכְרֶת infinit., ut sit sensus: perit spes mea, recordante me afflictionis meæ.* Calvin also gives the preference to this view, with the remark: *Videtur enim hic propheta exprimere, quomodo fere a spe exciderit, ut nihil reperiret amplius fortitudinis in Deo, quia scilicet oppressus erat malis;* in support of which he affirms that it is *valde absurdum, eos qui experti sunt aliquando Dei misericordiam, sic omnem spem abdicere, ut non statuant amplius sibi esse refugium ad Deum.*

in the wake of Luther ("Thou wilt assuredly think thereon"), C. B. Michaelis, Pareau, Rosenmüller, and Kalkschmidt take it as second pers. : "Think, yea, think wilt Thou, that my soul is bowed down in me," or "that my soul is at rest within me" (Nägelsbach). But it is impossible to maintain either of these views in the face of the language employed. To take the **וְ** before **שִׁתְּ** in the meaning of *quod* is characterized by Nägelsbach as an arbitrary procedure, unwarranted either by Gen. xxx. 27 or Ezek. xiii. 11 ; but neither can the meaning of resting, being at ease, which is attributed to **שָׁבַת** or **שִׁתְּ** by that writer, be established. The verb means to sink down, Prov. ii. 18, and metaphorically, to be bowed down, Ps. xlii. 26. The latter meaning is required in the present passage, from the simple fact that the sentence undeniably refers to Ps. xlii. 6.¹ **וְתִשְׁתַּחַ** expresses the consequence of **זָכַר** **פִּזְפָּר**, which therefore can only be the third pers., and "my soul" the subject of both clauses ; for there is no logical consecution of meaning given by such a rendering as, "If Thou wilt remember, my soul shall be bowed within me." The expression, "If my soul duly meditates thereon (on the deep suffering), it becomes depressed within me," forms the foundation of the request that God would think of his distress, his misery ; and ver. 21, "I will lay this to heart," connects itself with the leading thought set forth in ver. 19, the reason for which is given in ver. 20, viz. that my soul is only bowed down within me over the thought of my distress, and must complain of it to God, that He may think of it and alleviate it : This will I lay to heart and set my hope upon. **עַל־כֵּן** is a strong inferential expression : "therefore," because God alone can help, will I hope. This self-encouragement begins with ver. 22, inasmuch as the prophet strengthens his hope by a consideration of the infinite compassion of the Lord. (It is) **חִסְדֵּי יְהוָה**, "the mercies of God," i.e. proofs of His mercy (cf. Ps. lxxxix. 2, cvii. 43, Isa. lxiii. 7), "that we are not utterly consumed," as Luther [and similarly our English translators] have excellently rendered **תְּכִנֵּנוּ**. This form stands for **תְּפִזְזֵנוּ**, as in Jer. xlii. 18, Num. xvii. 28, not for **תְּפִזְזֵנוּ**, third

¹ Luther's translation, "for my soul tells me," is founded on the circumstance that the LXX. have mistaken **שִׁתְּ** for **שִׁתְּ** : **καταδολεσχήσει ἐπ** **έμει ἡ ψυχή μου.**

pers., as Pareau, Thenius, Vaihinger, and Ewald, referring to his *Grammar*, § 84, b, would take it. The proofs of the grace of God have their foundation in His compassion, from which they flow. In ver. 23 we take „חֶסֶד“ as the subject of חֶדְשִׁים; it is the proofs of the grace of God that are new every morning, not “His compassions,” although the idea remains the same. לְבָקָרִים, every morning, as in Isa. xxxiii. 2, Ps. lxxiii. 14. *Ubi sol et dies oritur, simul et radii hujus inexhaustæ bonitatis erumpunt* (Tarnovius in Rosenmüller). The consciousness of this constant renewal of the divine favour impels to the prayerful exclamation, “great is Thy faithfulness;” cf. Ps. xxxvi. 6.—Ver. 24. “My portion is Jahveh:” this is a reminiscence from Ps. xvi. 5, lxxiii. 26, cxlii. 6; cf. Ps. cxix. 57, where the expression found here is repeated almost *verbatim*. The expression is based on Num. xviii. 20, where the Lord says to Aaron, “I am thy portion and thine inheritance;” i.e. Jahveh will be to the tribe of Levi what the other tribes receive in their territorial possessions in Canaan; Levi shall have his possession and enjoyment in Jahveh. The last clause, “therefore will I hope,” etc., is a repetition of what is in ver. 21b, as if by way of refrain.

This hope cannot be frustrated, ver. 25. The fundamental idea of the section contained in vers. 25–33 is thus stated by Nägelsbach: “The Lord is well disposed towards the children of men under all circumstances; for even when He smites them, He seeks their highest interest: they ought so to conduct themselves in adversity, that it is possible for Him to carry out His designs.” On ver. 25, cf. Ps. xxxiv. 9, lxxxvi. 5; and on the general meaning, also Ps. xxv. 3, lxix. 7. If the Lord is kind to those who hope in Him, then it is good for man to wait patiently for His help in suffering. Such is the mode in which ver. 26 is attached to ver. 25. טוב, vers. 26 and 27, followed by ? *dat.*, means to be good for one, i.e. beneficial. Some expositors (Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Maurer, Nägelsbach) take לִיחַל as a noun-form, substantive or adjective; זְמָם is then also taken in the same way, and וְ—וְ as correlative: “it is good both to wait and be silent.” But although there are analogous cases to support the view that לִיחַל is a noun-form, the constant employment of זְמָם as an adverb quite prevents

us from taking it as an adjective. Moreover, “to be silent for the help of the Lord,” would be a strange expression, and we would rather expect “to be silent and wait for;” and finally, waiting and silence are so closely allied, that the disjunctive \rightarrow *et*—*et* appears remarkable. We prefer, then, with Ewald (*Gram.* § 235, *a*) and others, to take **לִתְחַיֵּה** as a verbal form, and that, too, in spite of the *i* in the jussive form of the Hiphil for **לִתְחַיֵּה**, from **לְחַיָּה**, in the meaning of **לִתְחַיֵּה**, to wait, tarry. “It is good that he (man) should wait, and in silence too (*i.e.* without complaining), for the help of the Lord.” On the thought presented here, cf. Ps. xxxviii. 7 and Isa. xxx. 15. Hence it is also good for man to bear a yoke in youth (ver. 27), that he may exercise himself in calm waiting on the help of the Lord. In the present context the yoke is that of sufferings, and the time of youth is mentioned as the time of freshness and vigour, which render the bearing of burdens more easy. He who has learned in youth to bear sufferings, will not sink into despair should they come on him in old age. Instead of **בַּגְעָרָיו**, Theodotion has **ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ**, which is also the reading of the Aldine edition of the LXX.; and some codices have **מִגְעָרָיו**. But this reading is evidently a correction, prompted by the thought that Jeremiah, who composed the Lamentations in his old age, had much suffering to endure from the time of his call to the prophetic office, in the earlier portion of his old age; nor is it much better than the inference of J. D. Michaelis, that Jeremiah composed this poem when a youth, on the occasion of King Josiah’s death.—In vers. 28-30, the effect of experience by suffering is set forth, yet not in such a way that the verses are to be taken as still dependent on **בָּ** in ver. 27 (Luther, Pareau, De Wette, Maurer, and Thenius): “that he should sit alone and be silent,” etc. Such a combination is opposed to the independent character of each separate alphabetic strophe. Rather, the result of early experience in suffering and patience is developed in a cohortative form. The connection of thought is simply as follows: Since it is good for man that he should learn to endure suffering, let him sit still and bear it patiently, when God puts such a burden on him. Let him sit solitary, as becomes those in sorrow (see on i. 1), and be silent, without murmuring (cf. ver. 26), when He lays a

burden on him. There is no object to **לְנַפְלֵל** expressly mentioned, but it is easily understood from the notion of the verb (if He lays anything on him), or from **לְי** in ver. 27 (if He lays a yoke on him). We are forbidden to consider the verbs as indicatives ("he sits alone and is silent;" Gerlach, Nägelsbach) by the apocopated form **לְנַפְלֵל** in vers. 29, 30, which shows that **לְשִׁיבָה** and **לְמַכְנֵה** are also cohortatives.—Ver. 29. "Let him put his mouth in the dust," *i.e.* humbly bow beneath the mighty hand of God. The expression is derived from the Oriental custom of throwing oneself in the most reverential manner on the ground, and involves the idea of humble silence, because the mouth, placed in the dust, cannot speak. The clause, "perhaps there is hope," indicates the frame of mind to be observed in the submission. While the man is to show such resignation, he is not to give up the hope that God will deliver him from trouble; cf. Job xi. 18, Jer. xxxi. 17.—Ver. 30. Let him also learn patiently to bear abuse and reviling from men. Let him present his cheek to him who smites him, as was done by Job (Job xvi. 10) and the servant of Jahveh (Isa. l. 6); cf. Matt. v. 39. On ver. 30b, cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 4, cxxiii. 3, etc. There is a certain gradation in the three verses that is quite unmistakeable. The sitting alone and in silence is comparatively the easiest; it is harder to place the mouth in the dust, and yet cling to hope; it is most difficult of all to give the cheek to the smiter, and to satiate oneself with dishonour (Nägelsbach). In vers. 31–33 follow the grounds of comfort. The first is in ver. 31: the sorrow will come to an end; the Lord does not cast off for ever; cf. Jer. iii. 5, 12. The second is in ver. 32: when He has caused sorrow, He shows pity once more, according to the fulness of His grace. Compassion outweighs sorrow. On this subject, cf. Ps. xxx. 6, Job v. 18, Isa. liv. 8. The third ground of comfort is in ver. 33: God does not send affliction willingly, as if it brought Him joy (cf. Jer. xxxii. 41), but merely because chastisement is necessary to sinful man for the increase of his spiritual prosperity; cf. Acts xiv. 22, 2 Cor. iv. 17. **לְנַפְלֵל** is for **לְנַפְלֵלָה**: cf. Ewald, § 232, *f*; Gesenius, § 69, 3, Rem. 6.

That he may bring home to the hearts of God's people the exhortation to bear suffering with patience and resignation,

and that he may lead them to see that the weight of sorrow under which they are sighing has been sent from the Lord as a chastisement for their sins, the prophet carries out the thought, in vers. 34-39, that every wrong committed upon earth is under the divine control (vers. 34-36), and generally that nothing happens without God's permission; hence man ought not to mourn over the suffering that befalls him, but rather over his sins (vers. 37-39).—Verses 34-36 form one connected sentence: while the subject and predicate for the three infinitival clauses do not follow till the words רְאֵה לֹא אָדָם לְאָדָם, the infinitives with their objects depend on רְאֵה. If there were any foundation for the assertion of Böttcher in his *Aehrenlese*, that רְאֵה never occurs in construction with ל, we could take the infinitives with ל as the objects of רְאֵה, in the sense, "As to the crushing of all the prisoners," etc. But the assertion is devoid of truth, and disproved by 1 Sam. xvi. 7, וַיַּרְא אַדְמָם לְעַבְדִים וַיַּהַוֵּה.

רְאֵה לְלִבָּב. In the three infinitival clauses three modes of unjust dealing are set forth. The treading down to the earth of all prisoners under his (the treader's) feet, refers to cruel treatment of the Jews by the Chaldeans at the taking of Jerusalem and Judah, and generally to deeds of violence perpetrated by victors in war. This explains בְּלָאָסְרֵי אָרֶץ, which Kalkschmidt and Thenius incorrectly render "all captives of the land (country)." Those intended are prisoners generally, who in time of war are trodden down to the earth, *i.e.* cruelly treated. The other two crimes mentioned, vers. 35 and 36, are among the sins of which Judah and Israel have been guilty,—the former being an offence against the proper administration of justice, and the latter falling under the category of unjust practices in the intercourse of ordinary life. "To pervert the right of a man before the face of the Most High" does not mean, in general, *proterve, et sine ulla numinis inspectantis reverentiā* (C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller); but just as הַטּוֹת מְשֻׁפְטָת is taken from the law (Ex. xxiii. 6; Num. xvi. 19, etc.), so also is גַּנְדָּר פְּנֵי עַלְמָן to be explained in accordance with the directions given in the law (Ex. xxii. 7, 9), that certain causes were to be brought before הַאֲלֹהִים, where this word means the judge or judges pronouncing sentence in the name

of God; cf. Ps. lxxxii. 6, where the judges, as God's representatives, are called בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים. "Before the face of the Most High" thus means, before the tribunal which is held in the name of the Most High. "To turn aside a man in his cause" means to pervert his right in a dispute (cf. Job viii. 3, xxxiv. 12, etc.), which may also be done in contested matters that do not come before the public tribunal. The meaning of the three verses depends on the explanation given of רָאָה לֹא אָרְאָנִי, which is a disputed point. רָאָה with לֹא, "to look on something," may mean to care for it, be concerned about it, but not to select, choose, or to resolve upon, approve (Michaelis, Ewald, Thenius). Nor can the prophet mean to say, "The Lord does not look upon the treading down of the prisoners, the perversion of justice." If any one be still inclined, with Rosenmüller and others, to view the words as the expression of a fact, then he must consider them as an exception taken by those who murmur against God, but repelled in ver. 37. Moreover, he must, in some such way as the following, show the connection between vers. 33 and 34, by carrying out the idea presented in the exhortation to hope for compassion: "But will any one say that the Lord knows nothing of this—does not trouble Himself about such sufferings?" Whereupon, in ver. 37, the answer follows: "On the contrary, nothing happens without the will of God" (Gerlach). But there is no point of attachment that can possibly be found in the words of the text for showing such a connection; we must therefore reject this view as being artificial, and forced upon the text. The difficulty is solved in a simple manner, by taking the words רָאָה לֹא אָרְאָנִי as a question, just as has been already done in the Chaldee paraphrase: *fierine potest ut in conspectu Jovæ non reveletur?* The absence of the interrogative particle forms no objection to this, inasmuch as a question is pretty often indicated merely by the tone. Ver. 38 must also be taken interrogatively. Böttcher and Thenius, indeed, think that the perfect הָנָה is incompatible with this; but the objection merely tells against the rendering, "Should not the Lord see it?" (De Wette, Maurer, Kalkschmidt), which of course would require רָאָה. But the idea rather is, "Hath not the Lord looked upon this?" The various acts of injustice mentioned in the three

verses are not set forth merely as possible events, but as facts that have actually occurred.—Ver. 37 brings the answer to this question in a lively manner, and likewise in an interrogative form: “Who hath spoken, and it came to pass, which the Lord hath not commanded?” The thought here presented reminds us of the word of the Creator in Gen. i. 3 ff. The form of the expression is an imitation of Ps. xxxiii. 9. Rosenmüller gives the incorrect rendering, *Quis est qui dixit: factum est* (*i.e.* *quis audeat dicere fieri quicquam*), *non præcipiente Deo*; although the similar but more free translation of Luther, “Who dares to say that such a thing happens without the command of the Lord?” gives the sense in a general way. The meaning is as follows: Nothing takes place on the earth which the Lord has not appointed; no man can give and execute a command against the will of God. From this it further follows (ver. 38), that evil and good will proceed from the mouth of the Lord, *i.e.* be wrought by Him; on this point, cf. Isa. xlv. 7, Amos iii. 6. נִתְּנָהּ נִתְּנָהּ gives no adequate meaning unless it be taken interrogatively, and as indicating what is usual—wont to be. And then there is established from this, in ver. 39, the application of the general principle to the particular case in question, viz. the grievous suffering of individuals at the downfall of the kingdom of Judah. “Why does a man sigh as long as he lives? Let every one [sigh] for his sins.” Man is not to sigh over suffering and sorrow, but only over his sin. נִתְּנָהּ occurs only here and in Num. xi. 1, and signifies to sigh, with the accessory notion of murmuring, complaining. הַ is appended to נִתְּנָהּ is more of a predicate than a simple attributive: man, as long as he lives, *i.e.* while he is in this life. The verse is viewed in a different light by Pareau, Ewald, Neumann, and Gerlach, who combine both members into one sentence, and render it thus: “Why doth a man complain, so long as he lives,—a man over the punishment of his sins?” [Similar is the rendering of our “Authorized” Version.] Neumann translates: “A man in the face of [Ger. *bei*] his sins.” But this latter rendering is lexically inadmissible, because בְּ in this connection cannot mean “in view of.” The other meaning assigned is improbable, though there is nothing against it, lexically considered. For though נִתְּנָהּ, sin, may also signify the

punishment of sin, the latter meaning does not suit the present context, because in what precedes it is not said that the people suffer for their sins, but merely that their suffering has been appointed by God. If, then, in what follows, there is an exhortation to return to the Lord (ver. 40 f.), and in ver. 42 a confession of sins made; if, moreover, ver. 39 forms the transition from vers. 33–38 to the exhortation that succeeds (ver. 40 ff.); then it is not abstinence from murmuring or sighing over the punishment of sins that forms the true connecting link of the two lines of thought, but merely the refraining from complaint over sufferings, coupled with the exhortation to sigh over their own sins. Tarnov also has viewed the verse in this way, when he deduces from it the advice to every soul labouring under a weight of sorrows: *est igitur optimus ex malis emergendi modus Deum excusare et se ipsum accusare.*

Vers. 40–54. Confession of sins, and complaint against the cruelty of enemies, as well as over the deep misery into which all the people have sunk. Vers. 40–42. The acknowledgment of guilt impels to prayer, to which also there is a summons in vers. 40, 41. The transitional idea is not, “Instead of grumbling in a sinful spirit, let us rather examine our conduct” (Thenius); for the summons to examine one’s conduct is thereby placed in contrast with ver. 39, and the thought, “let every one mourn over his own sins,” transformed into a prohibition of sinful complaint. The real transition link is given by Rosenmüller: *quum mala nostra a peccatis nostris oriantur, culpas nostras et scrutemur et corrigamus.* The searching of our ways, *i.e.* of our conduct, if it be entered on in an earnest spirit, must end in a return to the Lord, from whom we have departed. It is self-evident that יְהֹוָה עַד does not stand for יְהֹוָה לְאָלֶף, but means as far as (even to) Jahveh, and indicates thorough conversion—no standing half-way. The lifting up of the heart to the hands, also,—not merely of the hands to God,—expresses earnest prayer, that comes from the heart. אֶל-כְּפָרִים, to the hands (that are raised towards heaven). “To God in heaven,” where His almighty throne is placed (Ps. ii. 4), that He may look down from thence (ver. 59) and send help. With ver. 42 begins the prayer, as is shown by the direct address to God in the second member. There is no need, however, on

this account, for supplying לְאַמְרָה before the first member; the command to pray is immediately followed by prayer, beginning with the confession of sins, and the recognition of God's chastisement; cf. Ps. cxi. 6, Dan. ix. 5. נָנַחַ is contrasted with נָנַתָּה. "Thou hast not pardoned," because Thy justice must inflict punishment.—Vers. 43-45. God has not pardoned, but positively punished, the people for their misdeeds. "Thou hast covered with anger," ver. 43, corresponds to "Thou hast covered with a cloud," ver. 44; hence "Thou hast covered" is plainly used both times in the same meaning, in spite of the fact that נָנַחַ is wanting in ver. 43. נָכַר means to "cover," here to "make a cover." "Thou didst make a cover with anger," i.e. Thou didst hide Thyself in wrath; there is no necessity for taking נָכַר as in itself reflexive. This mode of viewing it agrees also with what follows. The objection of J. D. Michaelis, *qui se obtagit non persecuitur alios, ut statim additur*, which Böttcher and Thenius have repeated, does not hold good in every respect, but chiefly applies to material covering. And the explanation of Thenius, "Thou hast covered us with wrath, and persecuted us," is shown to be wrong by the fact that נָכַר signifies to cover for protection, concealment, etc., but not to cover in the sense of heaping upon, pouring upon (as Luther translates it); nor, again, can the word be taken here in a sense different from that assigned to it in ver. 44. "The covering of wrath, which the Lord draws around Him, conceals under it the lightnings of His wrath, which are spoken of immediately afterwards" (Nägelsbach). The anger vents itself in the persecution of the people, in killing them unsparingly. For, that these two are connected, is shown not merely in ver. 66, but still more plainly by the threatening in Jer. xxix. 18: "I will pursue them with sword, and famine, and pestilence, and give them for maltreatment to all the kingdoms of the earth." On "Thou hast slain, Thou hast not spared," cf. ii. 21. In ver. 44, נָנַחַ is further appended to נָכַר: "Thou makest a cover with clouds for Thyself," round about Thee, so that no prayer can penetrate to Thee; cf. Ps. lv. 2. These words form the expression of the painful conclusion drawn by God's people from their experience, that God answered no cry for help that came to Him, i.e. granted no help. Israel was

thereby given up, in a defenceless state, to the foe, so that they could treat them like dirt and abuse them. סְפִיחָה (from סְפִיחָה, Ezek. xxvi. 4), found only here as a noun, signifies “sweepings;” and מַאֲוִים is a noun, “disesteem, aversion.” The words of ver. 45, indeed, imply the dispersion of Israel among the nations, but are not to be limited to the maltreatment of the Jews in exile; moreover, they rather apply to the conduct of their foes when Judah was conquered and Jerusalem destroyed. Such treatment, especially the rejection, is further depicted in ver. 46. The verse is almost a *verbatim* repetition of ii. 16, and is quite in the style of Jeremiah as regards the reproduction of particular thoughts; while Thenius, from the repetition, is inclined to infer that chaps. ii. and iii. had different authors: cf. Gerlach on the other side. The very next verse might have been sufficient to keep Thenius from such a precipitate conclusion, inasmuch as it contains expressions and figures that are still more clearly peculiar to Jeremiah. On בְּפִרְבָּחָת, cf. Jer. xlvi. 43; הַשְׁבָּרָה is also one of the favourite expressions of the prophet. הַשְׁאָתָה is certainly ἄπ. λεγ., but reminds one of בְּנֵי שָׁתָן, Num. xxiv. 17, for which in Jer. xlvi. 45 there stands בְּנֵי שָׁבָּא. It comes from שָׁשַׁ, to make a noise, roar, fall into ruins with a loud noise, *i.e.* be laid waste (cf. Isa. vi. 11); and, as Raschi has already observed, it has the same meaning as שָׁבָּת, “devastation,” Isa. xxiv. 12. It is incorrect to derive the word from the Hiphil of נִשְׁאַר (J. D. Michaelis and Ewald), according to which it ought to mean “disappointment,” for the ה does not form an essential portion of the word, but is the article, as הַשְׁבָּרָה shows. Still more erroneous are the renderings ἐπαρσίς (LXX., from σύρειν) and *vaticinatio* (Jerome, who has confounded הַשְׁאָתָה with נִשְׁאָר).

Over this terrible calamity, rivers of tears must be shed, until the Lord looks down from heaven on it, vers. 48–51. The prophet once more utters this complaint in the first person, because he who has risked his life in his endeavour to keep the people in the service of God must feel the deepest sympathy for them in their misfortunes. “Rivers of water” is stronger than “water,” i. 16, and “tears like a stream,” ii. 18; but the mode of expression is in the main like that in those passages, and used again in Ps. cxix. 136, but in a different connection.

The second member of the verse is the same as in ii. 11. —Ver. 49. נָפַר means to be poured out, empty self ; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 14, Mic. i. 4. “And is not silent” = and rests not, i.e. incessantly ; cf. Jer. xiv. 17. חַפְנוּת קָאָן does not mean, *eo quod non sint intermissiones miseriarum vel fletus* (C. B. Michaelis and Rosenmüller, following the Chaldee), but, “so that there is no intermission or drying up.” As to the חַפְנוּת, which means the same as פָּגַת, see on ii. 18. “Until the Lord look down from heaven and examine,” in order to put an end to the distress, or to take compassion on His people. On נָשַׁקְתִּי, cf. Ps. xiv. 2, cii. 20.—Ver. 51, taken literally, runs thus: “Mine eye does evil to my soul” (לְזִבְעָן with לְ signifies to inflict an injury on one, cause suffering, as in i. 2, 22, ii. 20), i.e. it causes pain to the soul, as the Chaldee has already paraphrased it. The expression does not merely signify “causes me grief” (Thenius, Gerlach) ; but the eye, weakened through incessant weeping, causes pain to the soul, inasmuch as the pain in the eye increases the pain in the soul, i.e. heightens the pain of the soul through the superaddition of physical pain (Nägelsbach). Ewald has quite missed the meaning of the verse in his translation, “Tears assail my soul,” and in his explanatory remark that לְזִבְעָן is used in a bad sense, like the Latin *afficit* ; for, if לְזִבְעָן had this meaning, נְזִבְעָן could not stand for tears, because it is not the tears, but only the eyes weakened by weeping, that affect the soul with pain. Ewald is also wrong in seeking, with Grotius, to understand “the daughters of my city” as signifying the country towns, and to explain the phrase by referring to ii. 22. For, apart from the consideration that the appeal to ii. 22 rests on a false conception of that passage, the meaning attributed to the present verse is shown to be untenable by the very fact that the expression “daughters of my city” is never used for the daughter-towns of Jerusalem ; and such a designation, however possible it might be in itself, would yet be quite incomprehensible in this present connection, where there is no other subject of lamentation, either before or after, than Jerusalem in its ruined condition, and the remnant of its inhabitants (Gerlach). “The daughters of my city” are the daughters of Jerusalem, the female portion of the inhabitants of the city before and after its destruction. Nor will what is

added, “because of the daughters of my city,” seem strange, if we consider that, even in i. 4, 18 and ii. 20, 21, the fate and the wretched condition of the virgins of the city are mentioned as peculiarly deplorable, and that, in fact, the defenceless virgins were most to be pitied when the city fell; cf. v. 11. But the objection of Böttcher and Thenius, that **מַלְכָל בָּנֹות עִירִי** forms a harsh construction, whether we view it grammatically or in the light of the circumstances, inasmuch as **ל**, after “mine eye pains me,” is unsuitable, whether taken in a causal or a comparative meaning:—this objection, certainly, has some truth in its favour, and tells against any attempt to take the words as indicating a comparison. But there is nothing against the causal meaning, if “mine eye causes pain to my soul” merely signifies “my eye pains me,” because the pain of the eye is the result of the profuse weeping. If those words, however, possess the meaning we have given above (the pain in the eyes increases the smart in the soul), then there is nothing strange at all in the thought, “The evil condition of the daughters of my city is so deplorable, that mine eyes fail through weeping, and the sorrow of my soul is thereby intensified.” Gerlach has already refuted, though more fully than was necessary, the conjecture of Böttcher, that **בָּנֹות** should be changed into **בָּכֹות** (from all the weeping of my city).—Vers. 52–54. His pain and sorrow over the sad condition of the people recall to his memory the persecutions and sufferings which the godly have endured. The figure, “They who without cause are mine enemies have hunted me like a bird,” is an imitation of Ps. xi. 1. **שְׁנָאֵי חֶסֶם** reminds one of **אָנָּבֵי חֶסֶם**, Ps. xxxv. 19 and lxix. 5. But the prophet prefers **אָנָּבֵי** to **שְׁנָאֵי**, lest any one should restrict the words to persecutions which arose out of personal hatred.—Ver. 53. **צָמֹת** is here used transitively in Kal, as the Piel is elsewhere, Ps. cxix. 139, and the Pilpel, Ps. lxxxviii. 17. **צָמֹת בְּפֹתַר**, “they were destroying (cutting off) my life down into the pit,” is a pregnant construction, and must be understood *de conatu*: “they sought to destroy my life when they hurled me down into the pit, and cast stones on me,” *i.e.* not “they covered the pit with a stone” (Pareau, De Wette, Neumann). The verb **יָדַה** construed with **בְּ** does not take this meaning, for **יָדַה** merely signifies to cast,

e.g. lots (Josh. iv. 3, etc.), arrows (Jer. l. 14), or to throw down = destroy, annihilate, Zech. ii. 4; and 'בָּעֵד does not mean "in the pit in which I was," but "upon (or against) me." The sing. אָנֹת is to be understood in accordance with the expression אָנֹת חַנְמָתָא, to cast stones = stone (1 Kings xii. 18; Lev. xx. 2, 27). As to וַיַּעֲמֹד for וַיַּעֲמֹד, see on וַיַּעֲמֹד in ver. 33. "Waters flowed over my head" is a figurative expression, denoting such misery and distress as endanger life; cf. Ps. lxix. 2, 3, 15 f., cxxiv. 4 f., xlii. 8. "I said (thought), I am cut off (from God's eyes or hand)," Ps. xxxi. 23, lxxxviii. 6, is a reminiscence from these Psalms, and does not essentially differ from "cut off out of the land of the living," Isa. liii. 8. For, that we must thereby think of death, or sinking down into Sheol, is shown by מִבּוֹד תְּחִתּוֹת, ver. 55. The complaint in these verses (52-54) is regarded by some expositors as a description of the personal sufferings of Jeremiah; and the casting into the pit is referred to the incident mentioned in Jer. xxxviii. 6 ff. Such is the view, for instance, taken by Vaihinger and Nägelsbach, who point for proof to these considerations especially: (1) That the Chaldeans certainly could not, without good cause (ver. 53), be understood as the "enemies;" (2) that Jeremiah could not represent the people, speaking as if they were righteous and innocent; and (3) that the writer already speaks of his deliverance from their power, and contents himself with merely calling down on them the vengeance of God (vers. 55-66). But not one of these reasons is decisive. For, in the first place, the contents of ver. 52 do not harmonize with the known hostility which Jeremiah had to endure from his personal enemies. That is to say, there is nothing mentioned or known of his enemies having stoned him, or having covered him over with a stone, after they had cast him into the miry pit (Jer. xxxviii. 6 ff.). The figurative character of the whole account thus shows itself in the very fact that the separate portions of it are taken from reminiscences of passages in the Psalms, whose figurative character is universally acknowledged. Moreover, in the expression אָנֹת חַנְמָתָא, even when we understand thereby the Chaldeans, it is not at all implied that he who complains of these enemies considers himself righteous and innocent, but simply that he has not given them any good

ground for their hostile conduct towards him. And the assertion, that the writer is already speaking of his deliverance from their power, rests on the erroneous notion that, in vers. 55–66, he is treating of past events; whereas, the interchange of the perfects with imperatives of itself shows that the deliverance of which he there speaks is not an accomplished or bygone fact, but rather the object of that assured faith which contemplates the non-existent as existent. Lastly, the contrast between personal suffering and the suffering of the people, on which the whole reasoning rests, is quite beside the mark. Moreover, if we take the lamentations to be merely symbolical, then the sufferings and persecutions of which the prophet here complains are not those of the people generally, but of the godly Israelites, on whom they were inflicted when the kingdom was destroyed, not merely by the Chaldeans, but also by their godless fellow-countrymen. Hence we cannot, of course, say that Jeremiah here speaks from personal experience; however, he complains not merely of the persecutions that befell him personally, but also of the sufferings that had come on him and all godly ones. The same remark applies to the conclusion of this lamentation,—the prayer, vers. 55–66, in which he entreats the Lord for deliverance, and in the spirit of faith views this deliverance as already accomplished.

Vers. 55–66. Prayer for deliverance, and confident trust in its realization. Ver. 55. “Out of the lowest pit I call, O Lord, on Thy name;” cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 7, 14, cxxx. 1. The perfect קָרָאתִ is not a preterite,¹ but expresses what has already happened, and still happens. This is evident from the fact that the corresponding perfect, קָרַעַתִּ, ver. 56, is continued by the optative אַל־תַּעֲלִם. בָּרוּתְתִּי is taken from Ps. lxxxviii. 7: “pit of the lower regions of the earth,”—the אַרְצָתְתִּיּוֹת אַרְצָתִיּוֹת, Ps. lxiii.

¹ The perfects are so viewed by Nägelsbach, who also thinks that the speaker, in vers. 55–58, thanks the Lord for deliverance from the pit, and in ver. 55 reminds the Lord of the prayer he has addressed to Him out of the pit. But could he possibly think that the Lord had forgotten this? What, we should like to know, would be the use of this reminder, even if אַל־תַּעֲלִם, ver. 56, could be taken as the words of address to the Lord? For we can discover no thanksgiving in vers. 55–58. This whole mode of viewing the passage breaks down before ver. 59: “Thou hast seen mine oppression; judge me!” For, if the perfects in vers. 55–58 are preterites,

10, Ezek. xxxii. 18, 24, *i.e.* Sheol, essentially the same with מִחְשָׁבִים, ver. 6, which is thereby connected with Ps. lxxxviii. 7, —the dark regions of the depth, whose open mouth is the grave for every one (see Delitzsch on Psalms, *l.c.*), hence the symbol of mortal danger.—Ver. 56. “Thou hast heard my voice” expresses the full assurance of faith from which the request comes: “Cover not Thine ear from my sighing.” רַוַּחַת, “breathing out again;” in Ezek. viii. 11, mitigation of oppression, yet not here *respiratio, relaxatio* (C. B. Michaelis, Rosenmüller, etc.),—since the asyndetic שִׁיעָרִים does not accord with such an interpretation,—but a relieving of oneself by means of deeply-drawn sighs, as in Job xxxii. 20; hence “sighing,” as Luther has already rendered it, following the Vulgate: *ne avertas aurem tuum a singultu meo* (Thenius, Gerlach, etc.).—In vers. 57 and 58, the writer still more fully expresses his confidence that the Lord will accept him. “Thou art near on the day when I call on Thee” is a sentence found in Ps. cxlv. 18, and uttered as the experience of all believers. “Thou sayest, Fear not,” *i.e.* Thou assurest me of Thine assistance; cf. Jer. i. 8, 17, etc. “Thou dost conduct the causes (Ger. *Streitsachen*) of my soul” רַבֵּי נֶפֶשׁ, *i.e.* not merely “my lawsuits,” but *causas quæ vitam et salutem meam concernunt* (C. B. Michaelis). This is shown by the parallel member, “Thou redeemest my life,” *sc.* from the destruction which threatens it; cf. 53 f., Ps. ciii. 4. With this is connected the request in ver. 59, “Thou dost certainly see my oppression” רַאֲתָה עֲזֹתָה from עֲזֹת, to bend, oppress), the oppression which I suffer; “judge my cause,” *i.e.* help me in my cause, cf. Jer. v. 28. The suppliant bases this request, vers. 60-62, on the recollection that God, as the Omniscient One, knows the plans and intentions of his opponents. “Thou seest all their plans for revenge.” נַקְמָה is not here the outcome of revenge,

then also רַאֲתָה, ver. 59, can only be a preterite; and the prophet can only be speaking of injustice that has been done him previously: hence he cannot add thereto the request, “Judge me,” inasmuch as the Lord (according to Nägelsbach) has already judged him by delivering him from the pit. Moreover, it is quite arbitrary to understand the perfects in vers. 59 and 62 as referring to what has been done and *is still being done* to the speaker by his enemies, if it be agreed that the perfects in vers. 55-58 refer only to past events.

but the thought of revenge cherished in the heart ; it does not, however, mean desire of revenge, or revengeful disposition, but simply the thinking and meditating on revenge, which certainly has the spirit of revenge for its basis, but is not identical with this. Their thoughts are the plans of vengeance. **לְ**, *dat. in-comm.*, “to my hurt ;” the reading **עַל** of some codices is simply a correction after ver. 61. This revenge they express in reproaches and invectives. **שְׁפָתִי**, “lips,” for utterances of the lips ; and **קְמִים** as in Ps. xviii. 40, 49 = **עַל**, Ps. iii. 2, etc. **מִתְשִׁבְתָּם** corresponds to **חִרְפָּתָם** to **חִנּוֹנָם**, ver. 61 ; and the whole of ver. 62 still depends on “Thou hearest,” without any need for supplying **הִי**, as Rosenmüller does. Thenius and Nägelsbach would combine ver. 62 with 63, and make the former dependent on **הַבִּיטָה** ; but this is unsuitable, nor do they consider that utterances or words are not seen (**הַבִּיט**), but heard (**עָשָׂה**). With this proposed combination there falls to the ground the further remark of Thenius, that “by lips, devising, sitting, rising up, are meant the conversation and consultation of the enemies one with another.” Sitting and rising up have nothing in common with speaking about any subject, but merely form a circumlocution for action generally : cf. Ps. cxxxix. 2; Deut. vi. 7, xi. 19; Isa. xxxvii. 28. The form **מִנְגִּנָּה** occurs nowhere else : Ewald considers it a form that has been lengthened for the purpose of designating a mocking song—“Sing-song.” This supposition has at least more to recommend it than the ingenious but worthless idea of Böttcher, that **מִנְגִּנָּה** is contracted from **מִהָּדָגִנָּה**, “what a stringed instrument am I to them ;” but it also is improbable. **מִנְגִּנָּה** is the subject of the **נִיּוֹת**, as words formed with **וּ** often express merely the subject of the idea contained in a noun or verb ; cf. Ewald, § 160, *b*, 3. After this statement of the hostile treatment which the speaker has to suffer, there follows the renewed and further extended request that God may reward the foes according to their deeds. **תָּשִׁיב**, “Thou shalt return,” is a confident expression of the request that God would do this ; hence the optative **תִּתְּהִנֵּן** follows in ver. 65. In ver. 64 is condensed the substance of what is contained in Ps. xxviii. 4. **מִגְנָח לְבָב**, covering (veil) of the heart, — an expression analogous to the **κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν**, 2 Cor. iii. 15,—is not obduration, or hardening, but blinding of

the heart, which casts into destruction ; but it can scarcely signify “madness” (Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychology*, Clark’s translation), since the Arabic ^{انساني} *insania, furor*, has probably received this meaning from ^ج *genius, daemon* ; cf. Gesenius, *Thes. s.v.*, and Rosenmüller, *ad h. l.* “Thy curse to them!” is not to be viewed as dependent on “give,” but to be explained in accordance with Ps. iii. 9, “Thy blessing [be] upon Thy people!”—thus, “May Thy curse be their portion!” The curse of God is followed by destruction. “Destroy them from under Jahveh’s heaven!” *i.e.* not merely *ut non sint amplius sub cælis* (C. B. Michælis), because ^{הָנָה} is not considered in this latter rendering. The heaven of Jahveh is the whole world, over which Jahveh’s authority extends ; the meaning therefore is, “Exterminate them wholly from the sphere of Thy dominion in the world,” or, Thy kingdom.

CHAP. IV.—SUBMISSION UNDER THE JUDGMENT OF GOD, AND HOPE.

- 1 How the gold becomes dim,—the fine gold changeth,—
Sacred stones are scattered about at the top of every street !
- 2 The dear sons of Zion, who are precious as fine gold,—
How they are esteemed as earthen pitchers, the work of a potter’s hands !
- 3 Even the she-wolves reach the breast, they suckle their young ones ;
[But] the daughter of my people [hath become] cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness.
- 4 The tongue of the suckling cleaveth to his palate for thirst ;
Young children ask for bread, [but] there is none breaking [it] for them.
- 5 Those who ate dainties [before] are desolate in the streets ;
Those who were carried on scarlet embrace dunghills.
- 6 The iniquity of the daughter of my people became greater than the sin of Sodom,
Which was overthrown as in a moment, though no hands were laid on her.
- 7 Her princes were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk,
They were redder in body than corals, their form was [that of] a sapphire.
- 8 Their form is darker than blackness,—they are not recognised in the streets ;
Their skin adhereth closely to their bones,—it hath become dry, like wood.

9 Better are those slain with the sword than those slain with hunger ;
 For these pine away, pierced through from [want of] the fruits of the field.

10 The hands of women [who were once] tender-hearted, have boiled their own children ;
 They became food to them in the destruction of the daughter of my people.

11 Jahveh accomplished His wrath : He poured out the burning of His anger ;
 And kindled a fire in Zion, and it devoured her foundations.

12 Would the kings of the earth, all the inhabitants of the world, not believe
 That an adversary and an enemy would enter in at the gates of Jerusalem ?

13 Because of the sins of her prophets, the iniquities of her priests,
 Who shed blood of righteous ones in her midst,

14 They wander [like] blind men in the streets ; they are defiled with blood,
 So that [people] could not touch their clothes.

15 "Keep off ! it is unclean !" they cried to them, "keep off ! keep off ! touch not !"
 When they fled, they also wandered ;
 [People] say among the nations, "They must no longer sojourn [here]."

16 The face of Jahveh hath scattered them ; no longer doth He look on them :
 They regard not the priests, they respect not old men.

17 Still do our eyes pine away, [looking] for our help, [which is] vanity :
 In our watching, we watched for a nation [that] will not help.

18 They hunt our steps, so that we cannot go in our streets ;
 Our end is near, our days are full,—yea, our end is come.

19 Our persecutors were swifter than the eagles of heaven ;
 They pursued us on the mountains, in the wilderness they laid wait for us.

20 The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of Jahveh, was caught in their pits,
 [Of] whom we thought, "In His shadow we shall live among the nations."

21 Be glad and rejoice, O daughter of Edom, dwelling in the land of Uz :
 To thee also shall the cup pass ; thou shalt be drunk, and make thyself naked.

22 Thy guilt is at an end, O daughter of Zion ; He will no more carry thee captive :
 He visiteth thine iniquity, O daughter of Edom ; He discovereth thy sins.

The lamentation over the terrible calamity that has befallen Jerusalem is distinguished in this poem from the lamentations in chap. i. and ii., not merely by the fact that in it the fate

of the several classes of the population is contemplated, but chiefly by the circumstance that the calamity is set forth as a well-merited punishment by God for the grievous sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. This consideration forms the chief feature in the whole poem, from the beginning to the end of which there predominates the hope that Zion will not perish, but that the appointed punishment will terminate, and then fall on their now triumphant enemies. In this fundamental idea of the poem, compared with the first two, there is plainly an advance towards the due recognition of the suffering as a punishment; from this point it is possible to advance, not merely to the hope regarding the future, with which the poem concludes, but also the prayer for deliverance in chap. v. The contents of the poem are the following: The princes and inhabitants of Zion are sunk into a terrible state of misery, because their guilt was greater than the sin of Sodom (vers. 1-11). Jerusalem has been delivered into the hands of her enemies on account of her prophets and priests, who have shed the blood of righteous ones (vers. 12-16), and because the people have placed their trust on the vain help of man (vers. 17-20). For this they must atone; for the present, however, the enemy may triumph; the guilt of the daughter of Zion will come to an end, and then the judgment will befall her enemies (vers. 21, 22).

Vers. 1-11. The misery that has come on the inhabitants of Jerusalem is a punishment for their deep guilt. The description given of this misery is divided into two strophes: for, first (vers. 1-6), the sad lot of the several classes of the population is set forth; then (vers. 7-11) a conclusion is drawn therefrom regarding the greatness of their sin.—Vers. 1-6. The first strophe. Ver. 1. The lamentation begins with a figurative account of the destruction of all that is precious and glorious in Israel: this is next established by the bringing forth of instances.—Vers. 1, 2 contain, not a complaint regarding the desolation of the sanctuary and of Zion, as Maurer, Kalkschmidt, and Thenius, with the LXX., assume, but, as is unmistakeably declared in ver. 2, a lamentation over the fearful change that has taken place in the fate of the citizens of Zion. What is stated in ver. 1 regarding the gold and the precious

stones must be understood figuratively ; and in the case of the “gold that has become dim,” we can as little think of the blackening of the gilding in the temple fabric when it was burnt, as think of bricks (Thenius) when “the holy stones” are spoken of. The בְּנֵי צִיּוֹן (inhabitants of Zion), ver. 2, are likened to gold and sacred stones ; here Thenius would arbitrarily change בְּנֵי into בְּנָה (houses, palaces). This change not merely has no critical support, but is objectionable on the simple ground that there is not a single word to be found elsewhere, through all the chapter, concerning the destruction of the temple and the palaces ; it is merely the fate of the men, not of the buildings, that is bewailed. “How is gold bedimmed !” מִים is the Hophal of מִמְעַן, to be dark, Ezek. xxviii. 3, and to darken, Ezek. xxxi. 8. The second clause, “how is fine gold changed !” expresses the same thing. שָׁנַת = שָׁנָה, according to the Chaldaizing usage, means to change (oneself), Mal. iii. 6. The growing dim and the changing refer to the colour, the loss of brilliancy ; for gold does not alter in substance. C. B. Michaelis and Rosenmüller are too specific when they explain that the gold represents *populus Judaicus* (or the *potior populi Hebræi pars*), *qui (que) quondam auri instar in sanctuario Dei fulgebat*, and when they see in אַבְנֵי קָרְשָׁן an allusion to the stones in the breast-plate of the high priest. Gold is generally an emblem of very worthy persons, and “holy stones” are precious stones, intended for a sacred purpose. Both expressions collectively form a figurative description of the people of Israel, as called to be a holy nation and a kingdom of priests. Analogous is the designation of the children of Israel as אַבְנֵי נָר, Zech. ix. 16 (Gerlach). פְּתַלְתַּלְתָּלָה, to be poured out (at all the corners of the streets), is a figurative expression, signifying disgraceful treatment, as in ii. 11. In ver. 2 follows the application of the figure to the sons (*i.e.* the citizens) of Zion, not merely the chief nobles of Judah (Ewald), or the princes, nor children in the narrowest sense of the word (Gerlach) ; for in what follows mention is made not only of children (vers. 3, 4), but also of those who are grown up (ver. 5), and princes are not mentioned till ver. 7. As being inmembers of the chosen people, all the inhabitants of Jerusalem have been held “dear,” and “weighed out with gold,” *i.e.* esteemed as of equal value with gold (cf. Job xxviii. 16, 19) ;

but now, when Jerusalem is destroyed, they have become regarded as earthenware pots, *i.e.* treated as if they were utterly worthless, as “a work of the hands of the potter,” whereas Israel was a work of the hands of God, Isa. lxiv. 7. סָלָה = סָלָה, cf. Job xxviii. 16, 19 [to weigh; Pual, be weighed out, as an equivalent]. This disregard or rejection of the citizens of Zion is evidenced in ver. 3 and onwards by many examples, beginning with children, ascending to adults (3-5), and ending with princes. The starvation to death of the children (vers. 3, 4) is mentioned first; and the frightful misery that has befallen Jerusalem is vividly set forth, by a comparison of the way in which wild animals act towards their young with the behaviour of the mothers of Jerusalem towards their children. Even jackals (תְּנִינִים for תְּנִינִים, see on Jer. ix. 10) give their breasts to their young ones to suck. חַלְצָא שָׁר, *extrahunt mammam* = they present their breast. As Junius has remarked, the expression is taken *a mulieribus lactantibus, quae laxata veste mammam lactanti præbent*; hence also we are not, for the sake of this expression, to understand תְּנִינִים as meaning *cetus* (Bochart and Nägelsbach), regarding which animal Bochart remarks (*Hieroz.* iii. p. 777, ed. Rosenmüller), *ceti papillas non esse ἐπιφανεῖς, quippe in mammis receptæ tanquam in vaginis conduntur*. Rosenmüller has already rejected this meaning as *minus apta* for the present passage. From the combination of jackals and ostriches as inhabiting desert places (Isa. xiii. 21 f.; Job xxx. 29), we have no hesitation in fixing on “jackals” as the meaning here. “The daughter of my people” (cf. ii. 11) here means the inhabitants of Zion or Jerusalem. לְאַכְּרָר, “has become cruel.” The *Kethib* בַּיִּנִים instead of בַּעֲנִים (*Qeri*) may possibly have arisen from a purely accidental separation of the letters of the word in a ms., a reading which was afterwards painfully retained by the scribes. But in many codices noted by Kennicott and De Rossi, as well as in several old editions, the word is found correctly joined, without any marginal note. עַנִּים means ostriches, usually בַּת עַנִּה (“daughter of crying,” or according to Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, and Ewald, following the Syriac, “the daughter of gluttony”), the female ostrich. The comparison with these animals is to be understood in accordance with Job xxxix. 16: “she (the female ostrich) treats her young ones

harshly, as if they were not her own." This popular belief is founded on the fact that the animal lays her eggs in the ground,—after having done no more than slightly scratching up the soil,—and partly also, when the nest is full, on the surface of the ground; she then leaves them to be hatched, in course of time, by the heat of the sun: the eggs may thus be easily broken, see on Job xxxix. 14–16.—Ver. 4. Sucking infants and little children perish from thirst and hunger; cf. ii. 11, 12. **פָּרְשָׁ** = **פְּרָסָ**, as in Mic. iii. 8, to break down into pieces, break bread = divide, Isa. lviii. 7, Jer. xvi. 7. In ver. 5 it is not children, but adults, that are spoken of. **לִמְעָדִים** is variously rendered, since **אָכְלָ** occurs nowhere else in construction with **לִ**. Against the assumption that **לִ** is the Aramaic sign of the object, there stands the fact that **אָכְלָ** is not found thus construed with **לִ**, either in the Lamentations or elsewhere, though in Jer. xl. 2 **לִ** is so used. Gerlach, accordingly, would take **לִמְעָדִים** adverbially, as meaning "after their heart's desire," prop. for pleasures (as to this meaning, cf. Prov. xxix. 17, 1 Sam. xv. 32), in contrast with **אָכְלָ לְשָׁבָע**, to eat for satisfaction, Ex. xvi. 3, Lev. xxv. 19, etc. But "for pleasure" is not an appropriate antithesis to satisfaction. Hence we prefer, with Thenius, to take **אָכְלָ** in the sense of nibbling round something, in which there is contained the notion of selection in the eating; we also take **מִעָדִים**, as in Gen. xl ix. 20, to mean dainties. **נִשְׁטָחוּ**, to be made desolate, as in i. 13, of the destruction of happiness in life; with **בְּחִצּוֹת**, to sit in a troubled or gloomy state of mind on the streets. **הָאָמְנִים**, those who (as children) were carried on purple (**עַלְ** for **תַּזְלִעַת** **שְׂנִי**, cochineal, crimson), embrace (*i.e.* cling to) dung-heaps, seek them as places of rest.—Ver. 6. The greatness of their guilt is seen in this misery. The **וְ** consecutive joined with **יָגֵל** here marks the result, so far as this manifests itself: "thus the offence (guilt) of the daughter of my people has become greater than the sin of Sodom." Most expositors take **חַטָּאת** here in the sense of punishment; but this meaning has not been established. The words simply mean "offence" and "sin," sometimes including their consequences, but nowhere do they mean unceremonious castigation. But when Thenius is of opinion that the context demands the meaning "punishment" (not "sin"), he has inconsiderately

omitted the *consec.*, and taken a wrong view of the context. **חַפֵּץ** is the usual word employed in connection with the destruction of Sodom ; cf. Gen. xix. 21, 25, Deut. xxix. 22, etc. **וְלֹא חַלֵּל** is translated by Thenius, *et non torquebatur in ea manus*, *i.e.* without any one wringing his hands. However, **לָחַל** (to go in a circle) means to writhe with pain, but does not agree with **חַלֵּל**, to wring the hands. In Hos. xi. 6 **לָחַל** is used of the sword, which “circles” in the cities, *i.e.* cuts and kills all round in them. In like manner it is here used of the hands that went round in Sodom for the purpose of overthrowing (destroying) the city. Nägelsbach wrongly derives **לָחַל** from **חַלֵּל**, to become slack, powerless. The words, “no hands went round (were at work) in her,” serve to explain the meaning of **בָּמוֹת בָּעֵל**, “as in a moment,” without any need for the hands of men being engaged in it. By this additional remark, not merely is greater prominence given to the sudden destruction of Sodom by the hand of God ; but it is also pointed out how far Jerusalem, in comparison with that judgment of God, suffers a greater punishment for her greater sins : for her destruction by the hand of man brings her more enduring torments. “Sodom’s suffering at death was brief ; for there were no children dying of hunger, no mothers who boiled their children” (Nägelsbach). Sodom was spared this heartrending misery, inasmuch as it was destroyed by the hand of God in an instant.

Vers. 7-11. The second strophe.—Vers. 7, 8. The picture of the misery that has befallen the princes. **נְזָרִים**, princes, prop. *separati*, here *non voto* (Nazarenes) *sed dignitate*, as Nolde appropriately remarks ; see on Gen. xlix. 26. **כְּבָשָׂה** is used, Job xv. 15, xxv. 5, of the brightness of the heaven and the stars ; here it is used of female beauty. Thenius would refer “pure (or bright) as snow and milk” to the white clothing, “because the Orientals have not milk-white faces.” But the second member irrefragably shows that the reference is to bodily form ; and for the very reason adduced by Thenius, a comparatively whiter skin than is commonly met with is esteemed more beautiful. So also does Cant. v. 10, “My friend is white and red,” show the high esteem in which beauty was held (Gerlach). **אַדְם**, to be reddish. **מֵצֶבֶת**, “bone,” for the body (*pars pro toto*). **פְּנִינִים**, not (white) pearls, but (red) corals. “The white and

the red are to be understood as mixed, and shading into one another, as our popular poetry speaks of cheeks which ‘like milk and purple shine’” (Delitzsch on Job xxviii. 18, Clark’s translation). “Sapphire their form” (בְּרִית, prop. cut, *taille*, of the shape of the body). The point of the comparison is not the colour, but the luminosity, of this precious stone. Once on a time the princes glittered so; but (ver. 8) now their form is dark as blackness, *i.e.* every trace of beauty and splendour has vanished. Through hunger and want their appearance is so disfigured, that they are no longer recognised in the streets (תִּצְחַח, in contrast with “at home,” in their own neighbourhood). “The skin sticks to the bones,” so emaciated are they; cf. Ps. cii. 4, Job xix. 20. צָפֵר, ἄπ. λεύ., to adhere firmly. The skin has become dry (בַּיִשׁ) like wood.—Ver. 9. This pining away with hunger is much more horrible than a speedy death by the sword. שָׁהַם, “for they” = *qui ipsi*; יָבוֹם, prop. flow away, *i.e.* pine away as those pierced through (מִרְקָרִים, cf. Jer. xxxvii. 10, li. 4). מִתְנִבּוֹת שׁ does not mean “of the fruits,” but שׁ is a brief expression for “because there are no fruits,” *i.e.* from want of the produce of the field; cf. בְּשִׁיר בַּחַשׁ מִשְׁמָן, “my flesh wastes away from oil,” *i.e.* because there is a want of oil, Ps. cix. 24. There was thus no need for the conjecture מִתְלָבָבָת, “from burning glow,” from drought, which has been proposed by Ewald in order to obtain the following sense, after supplying בְּ: “as if melting away through the drought of the field, emaciated by the glowing heat of the sun.” The free rendering of the Vulgate, *consumpti a sterilitate terræ*, gives no support to the conjecture.—Ver. 10. Still more horrible was the misery of the women. In order to keep themselves from dying of hunger, mothers boiled their children for food to themselves; cf. ii. 20. By the predicate “compassionate,” applied to hands, the contrast between this conduct and the nature, or the innate love, of mothers to their children, is made particularly prominent. בָּרוֹת is a noun = בָּרוֹת, Ps. lxix. 22. On “the destruction of the daughter of my people,” cf. ii. 11.—Ver. 11. This fearful state of matters shows that the Lord has fully poured out His wrath upon Jerusalem and His people. בְּלִת, to complete, bring to an end. The kindling of the fire in Zion, which consumed the foundations, is not to be limited to

the burning of Jerusalem, but is a symbol of the complete destruction of Zion by the wrath of God; cf. Deut. xxxii. 32.

Vers. 12-20. This judgment of wrath is a consequence of the sins of the prophets and priests (vers. 12-16), as well as of their vain trust on the help of man (vers. 17-20). Ver. 12 f. The capture of Jerusalem by enemies (an event which none in all the world thought possible) has been brought on through the sins of the prophets and priests. The words, "the kings of the earth . . . did not believe that an enemy would come in at the gates of Jerusalem," are well explained by C. B. Michaelis, thus: *reputando fortitudinem urbis, quæ munitissima erat, tum defensorem ejus Jehovah, qui ab hostibus, ad internectionem cæsis, urbem aliquoties, mirifice liberaverat, e.g. 2 Reg. xix. 34.* The words certainly form a somewhat overdrawn expression of deep subjective conviction; but they cannot properly be called a hyperbole, because the remark of Nägelsbach, that Jerusalem had been taken more than once before Nebuchadnezzar (1 Kings xiv. 26; 2 Kings xiv. 13 f.; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11; 2 Kings xxiii. 33 ff.), seems incorrect. For the occasions upon which Jerusalem was taken by Shishak and by Joash king of Israel (1 Kings xiv. and 2 Kings xiv.) belong to those earlier times when Jerusalem was far from being so strongly fortified as it afterwards became, in the times of Uzziah, Jotham, and Manasseh (2 Chron. xxvi. 9, xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 14). In 2 Chron. xxxiii. 11, on the other hand, there is nothing said of Jerusalem being taken; and the capture by Pharaoh-Necho does not call for consideration, in so far as it forms the beginning of the catastrophe, whose commencement was thought impossible. Ewald wrongly connects ver. 13 with ver. 12 into one sentence, thus: "that an enemy would enter the gates of Jerusalem because of the sins of her prophets," etc. The meaning of these verses is thereby not merely weakened, but also misrepresented; and there is ascribed to the kings and inhabitants of the world an opinion regarding the internal evils of Jerusalem, which they neither pronounced nor could have pronounced.—Ver. 12 contains an exclamation over the incredible event that has happened, and ver. 13 assigns the cause of it: the mediating and combining thought, "this incredible thing has happened," suggests itself. It has taken place on account of the sins of

her prophets and priests, who have shed the blood of righteous men in Jerusalem. A historic proof of this is furnished in Jer. xxvi. 7 ff., where priests and prophets indicted Jeremiah on a capital charge, because he had announced that Jerusalem and the temple would suffer the fate of Shiloh; from this, Nägelsbach rightly concludes that, in any case, the burden of the guilt of the martyr-blood that was shed falls on the priests and prophets. Besides this, cf. the denunciations of the conduct of the priests and prophets in Jer. vi. 13–15, xxiii. 11, xxvii. 10, Ezek. xxii. 25 f.—In vers. 14, 15, there is described the fate of these priests and prophets, but in such a way that Jeremiah has, throughout, mainly the priests before his mind. We may then, without further hesitation, think of the priests as the subject of **vv.**, inasmuch as they are mentioned last. Kalkschmidt wrongly combines vers. 13 and 14, thus: “because of the sins of the prophets . . . they wander about,” etc.; in this way, the Israelites would be the subject to **vv.**, and in ver. 14 the *calamitas ex sacerdotum prophetarumque sceleribus profecta* would be described. This, however, is contradicted, not merely by the undeniable retrospection of the expression, “they have polluted themselves with blood” (ver. 14), to the shedding of blood mentioned in ver. 13, but also by the whole contents of ver. 14, especially the impossibility of touching their clothes, which does not well apply to the people of Israel (Judah), but only to the priests defiled with blood. Utterly erroneous is the opinion of Pareau, Ewald, and Thenius, that in vers. 14–16 there is “presented a fragment from the history of the last siege of Jerusalem”—a rupture among the besieged, headed by the most eminent of the priests and prophets, who, filled with frenzy and passion against their fellow-citizens, because they would not believe in the speedy return of the exiles, became furious, and caused their opponents to be murdered. Regarding this, there is neither anything historical known, nor is there any trace of it to be discovered in these verses. The words, “prophets and priests hesitated (or wavered) like blind men on the streets, soiled with blood, so that none could touch their clothes,” merely state that these men, smitten of God in consequence of their blood-guiltiness, wandered up and down in the streets of the city, going about like blind men. This description has been imitated from such

passages as Deut. xxviii. 28 f., Jer. xxiii. 12, Isa. xxix. 9, where the people, and especially their leaders, are threatened, as a punishment, with blind and helpless staggering; but it is not to be referred to the time of the last siege of Jerusalem. שׁוּרִים does not mean *cædium perpetrandarum insatiabili cupiditate occæcati* (Rosenmüller), nor "as if intoxicated with blood that has been shed" (Nägelsbach), but as if struck with blindness by God, so that they could no longer walk with firm and steady step. "They are defiled with blood" is a reminiscence from Isa. lix. 3. As to the form נִנְאַל, compounded of the Niphal and Pual, cf. Ewald, § 132, b, and Delitzsch on Isaiah, *l.c.* יִכְלַל אֲלֹל, without one being able, *i.e.* so that one could not. As to the construction of יִכְלַל with a finite verb following, instead of the infinitive with הַ, cf. Ewald, § 285, c, c, and Gesenius, § 142, 3, b.—Ver. 15. "Yea, they (people) address to them the warning cry with which, according to Lev. xiii. 45, lepers were obliged to warn those whom they met not to come near." Such is the language in which Gerlach has rightly stated the connection between ver. 14 and ver. 15a. קְרָאוּ לִתְמֹן is rendered by many, "people shouted out regarding them," *de iis*, because, according to Lev. xiii. 45, it was the lepers who were to shout "Unclean!" to those they met; the cry therefore was not addressed to the unclean, but to those who, being clean, were not to defile themselves by touching lepers. But though this meaning may be taken from the language used (cf. Gen. xx. 13, Ps. iii. 3), yet here, where the call is addressed to persons, it is neither probable nor necessary. For it does not follow from the allusion to the well-known direction given to lepers, that this prescription is transferred *verbatim* to the present case. The call is here addressed to the priests, who are staggering towards them with blood-stained garments. These must get out of the way, and not touch those they meet. The sing. נִמְלַט is accounted for by the allusion to Lev. xiii. 45, and means, "Out of the way! there comes one who is unclean." The second half of the verse is variously viewed. נִצְח, as Milra, comes from נִצְחָה, which in Niphal means to wrangle, in Hiphil to stir up strife. The Vulgate, accordingly, translates *jurgati quippe sunt*, and Ewald still renders, "yet they quarrelled, yet they staggered." But this view is opposed by these considerations: (1.) יְמִינֵם can

neither introduce an antithesis, nor mean “yet . . . yet.” (2.) In view of the shedding of blood, wrangling is a matter of too little importance to deserve mention. Luther’s rendering, “because they feared and fled from them,” is a mere conjecture, and finds no support whatever from the words employed. Hence Gesenius, in his *Thesaurus*, has rightly explained נִצְחָה, after נִצְחָה, *Jer.* xlviii. 9, “to fly, flee, or take to flight.” Following him, the moderns translate: “because they had fled, they also staggered about.” It is better to render נִצְחָה by *quum*, “when they fled,” *sc.* to other nations, not specially to the Chaldeans. נִצְחָה is selected with reference to what precedes, but in the general meaning of roaming restlessly about. The idea is as follows: Not merely were they shunned at home, like lepers, by their fellow-countrymen, but also, when they wished to find a place of refuge beyond their native land, they were compelled to wander about without finding rest; for they said among the nations, “They shall no longer sojourn among us.” Thus the curse came on them, *Deut.* xxviii. 65 f.—Ver. 16. This was the judgment of God. His face (*i.e.* in this connection, His angry look; cf. *Lev.* xvii. 10, *Ps.* xxi. 10) has scattered them (חִלְקָה as in *Gen.* xlix. 7). No longer does He (Jahveh) look on them, *sc.* graciously. The face of the priests is not regarded. נִשְׁאָר פָּנִים, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, to regard the person of any one, *i.e.* to have respect to his position, dignity, and age: the expression is here synonymous with נִצְחָה, to show favour. The subject is indefinite, but the enemy is meant. Thus the threatening in *Deut.* xxviii. 50 is fulfilled on them. יִקְנִים does not mean “elders,” but “old men,” for the words can be referred only to the priests and prophets formerly spoken of.

Vers. 17–20. In spite of these facts, which show that God has poured out His fury on us, and that our prophets and priests have been smitten by God for their sins, we still wait, vainly relying on the help of man. In this way, ver. 17 is attached to what precedes,—not merely to ver. 16, but also the series of thoughts developed in vers. 12–16, viz. that in the capture of Jerusalem (which nobody thought possible) there is plainly made known the judgment of God upon the sins of His people and their leaders. It is with special emphasis that stands at the beginning of the verse: “still do our eyes continue to

waste away." The form עָזַרְנָה (*Kethib*), in place of which the *Qeri* substitutes עָזַרְנִי, is abnormal, since זָר does not take plural forms of the suffix in any other instance, and יְנָה—does not occur elsewhere as a noun-suffix. The form is evidently copied from תְּכִלְנָה, and must be third fem. pl., as distinguished from the singular-suffix עָזָרָה, 1 Kings i. 22. The *Qeri*, which is preferred by Michaelis, Pareau, Rosenmüller, and Thenius, has for its basis the idea "we still were;" this is shown by the translation ἔτι ὄντων ἡμῶν of the LXX., and *cum adhuc subsisteremus* of Jerome. But this view of the word, like most of the *Qeris*, is a useless attempt at explanation; for עָזַרְנִי alone cannot have the meaning attributed to it, and the supplements proposed, *in statu priori*, or "in the city," are but arbitrary insertions into the text. The combination עָזַרְנִיתְכִּלְנָה, which is a rare one, evidently means, "our eyes are still pining (consuming) away," so that the imperfect is used with the meaning of the participle; cf. Ewald, § 306, c, Rem. 2. The combination of פֶּלה with לְאָלָה is pregnant: "they consume away (while looking out) for our help;" cf. Deut. xxviii. 28, Ps. lxix. 4. לְהָבָה is not an exclamation, "in vain!" (Thenius), but stands in apposition to "our help;" thus, "for our help, a help of vanity," *i.e.* for a vain help; cf. Ewald, § 287, c. The vain help is more distinctly specified in the second member of the verse, as a looking out for a nation that will not help. צָפִיה does not mean "the watch-tower" (Chald., Syr., etc.),—because "on the watch-tower" would require to be expressed by לְעַלְתָּה; cf. Isa. xxi. 8, 2 Chron. xx. 24,—but "watching." By the "nation that does not help," expositors, following Jer. xxxvii. 7, think that Egypt is intended. But the words must by no means be referred to the event there described, inasmuch as we should then be obliged to take the verbs as preterites,—a course which would not accord with the interchange of the imperfect (תְּכִלְנָה) with the perfect (צָפִינָה). A strange confusion would also arise, such as is made out by Vaihinger: for we would find the prophet placing his readers, in ver. 14, in the time of the siege of Jerusalem; then, in ver. 15, into the conquered city; and in vers. 17 and 18, back once more into the beleaguered city, which we again, in ver. 19, see conquered (Gerlach). According to vers. 18-20, Judah is completely in the power of the Chaldeans; hence the

subject treated of in ver. 17 is the looking out for the assistance of some nation, after the enemy had already taken Jerusalem and laid it in ashes. What the prophet denounces, then, is that help is still looked for from a nation which nevertheless will not help. In this, perhaps, he may have had Egypt before his mind; for, that the Jews, even after the destruction of Jerusalem, still looked for deliverance or help from Egypt, may be inferred partly from the fact that those who were left in the country fled thither for refuge, and partly from Ezek. xxix. 16. Only, the words are not to be restricted merely to this. In order to show convincingly how vain it is to expect help from man, Jeremiah, in vers. 18–20, reminds his readers of the events immediately preceding the capture of the city, which have proved that nobody—not even the king himself—could avoid falling into the hands of the Chaldeans. Gerlach has correctly given the sense of these verses thus: “They still cling to their hopes, and are nevertheless completely in the power of the enemy, from whom they cannot escape. All their movements are closely watched; it is impossible for any one to deceive himself any longer: it is all over with the nation, now that all attempts at flight have failed (ver. 19), and that the king, ‘the life’s-breath’ of the nation, has fallen into the hands of the enemy.” Gerlach and Nägelsbach have already very properly set aside the strange and fanciful idea of Ewald, that in ver. 18 it is still Egypt that is regarded, and that the subject treated of is,—how Egypt, merely through fear of the Chaldeans, had at that time publicly forbidden the fugitives to go to Palestine for purposes of trade and traffic. These same writers have also refuted the arbitrary interpretation put upon צָעַרְנָה וּ by Thenius and Vaihinger, who imagine there is a reference to towers used in a siege, from which the besiegers could not merely perceive all that was going on within the city, but also shoot at persons who showed themselves in exposed places. In reply to this, Nägelsbach appropriately remarks that we must not judge of the siege-material of the ancients by the range of cannon. Moreover, צָעַר does not mean to spy out, but to search out, pursue; and the figure is taken from the chase. The idea is simply this: The enemy (the Chaldeans) watch us in our every step, so that we can no longer move freely about. Our

end is near, yea, it is already come; cf. Ezek. vii. 2-6. A proof of this is given in the capture of King Zedekiah, after he had fled in the night, ver. 19 f. For an elucidation of the matters contained in these verses, cf. Jer. xxxix. 4 f., lii. 7 f. The comparison of the enemy to eagles is taken from Deut. xxviii. 49, whence Jeremiah has already derived chap. iv. 13 and xlvi. 40. פָּנָץ, *prop.* to burn, *metaph.* to pursue hotly, is here (poet.) construed with acc., but elsewhere with אָפָּנָץ; cf. Gen. xxxi. 36, 1 Sam. xvii. 53. "On the hills and in the wilderness," *i.e.* on every side, even in inaccessible places. "In the wilderness" alludes to the capture of Zedekiah; cf. Jer. xxxix. 5. "The breath of our nostrils" is an expression founded on Gen. ii. 7, and signifying "our life's breath." Such is the designation given to the king,—not Zedekiah in special, whose capture is here spoken of, because he *ex initio magnam de se spem concitaverat, fore ut post tristia Jojakimi et Jechoniae fata pacationes publica esset* (Aben Ezra, Michaelis, Vaihinger), but the theocratic king, as the anointed of the Lord, and as the one who was the bearer of God's promise, 2 Sam. vii. In elucidation of the figurative expression, Pareau has appropriately reminded us of Seneca's words (*Clement.* i. 4): *ille (princeps) est spiritus vitalis, quem haec tot millia (civium) trahunt.* "What the breath is, in relation to the life and stability of the body, such is the king in relation to the life and stability of the nation" (Gerlach). "Of whom we said (thought), Under his shadow (*i.e.* protection and covering) we shall live among the nations." It is not implied in these words, as Nägelsbach thinks, that "they hoped to fall in with a friendly heathen nation, and there, clustering around their king, as their protector and the pledge of a better future, spend their days in freedom, if no more," but merely that, under the protection of their king, they hoped to live even among the heathen, *i.e.* to be able to continue their existence, and to prosper as a nation. For, so long as there remained to them the king whom God had given, together with the promises attached to the kingdom, they might cherish the hope that the Lord would still fulfil to them these promises also. But this hope seemed to be destroyed when the king was taken prisoner, deprived of sight, and carried away to Babylon into captivity. The words "taken in their pits" are figurative, and derived

from the capture of wild animals. שְׁחִיתָה as in Ps. cvii. 20. On the figure of the shadow, cf. Judg. ix. 15, Ezek. xxxi. 17.

Vers. 21, 22. However, it is not yet all over with Israel. Let the enemy triumph; the guilt of the daughter of Zion will come to an end, and then the guilt of the daughter of Edom will be punished. With this "Messianic hope," as Ewald rightly characterizes the contents of these verses, the lamentation resolves itself into joyous faith and hope regarding the future of Israel. There is no external sign to mark the transition from the depths of lamentation over the hopeless condition of Judah, to new and hopeful confidence, just as in the Psalms there is frequently a sudden change from the deepest lamentation to joyful confidence of final victory. But these transitions have their origin in the firm conviction that Israel has most assuredly been chosen as the nation with whom the Lord has made His covenant, which He cannot break. This truth has already been clearly and distinctly expressed in the threatenings and promises of the law, Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii., and is reiterated by all the prophets. The Lord will assuredly visit His ever-rebellious people with the heaviest punishments, until they come to acknowledge their sin and repent of their apostasy; but He will afterwards again take pity on the penitent remnant, gather them from among the heathen, and fulfil all His promises to them. The words "exult and rejoice" are ironical, and signify: "Rejoice as much as you please; you will not, for all that, escape the punishment for your sins." "The daughter of Edom," i.e. the people of Edom, is named as the representative of the enemies of God's people, on account of their implacable hatred against Israel; see on Jer. xlix. 7. From the designation, "dwelling in the land of Uz," it does not follow that the Edomites had at that time spread themselves widely over their original territory; for the land of Uz, according to Jer. xxv. 20, lay on the confines of Idumea. As to the form שְׁבָעֵת, see on Jer. x. 17. בְּעַלְקָה, "towards thee also (sc. as now to Judah) shall the cup pass." On this figure, cf. Jer. xxv. 15. הַתְּעַרְתָּה, to make oneself naked, or to become naked in consequence of drunkenness (Gen. ix. 22), is a figurative expression indicative of the disgrace that will befall Edom; cf. i. 8, Nah. iii. 5. עַזְנָךְ, "Thy guilt is ended." The

perfect is prophetic. The guilt is ended when it is atoned for ; the punishment for it has reached its end, or grace begins. That this will take place in the Messianic times (as was pointed out long ago in the Chaldee paraphrase, *et liberaberis per manum Messiae*), is not indeed implied in the word **מִשְׁמָרָה**, but it is a necessary product of the Messianic hope of Israel ; cf. for instance, Jer. i. 20. To this it cannot be objected (with Gerlachi), that it is inadmissible to transfer into the Messianic time also the punishment of Edom threatened in the second member: for, according to the prophetic mode of viewing things, the judgment on the heathen world falls, as a matter of course, in the Messianic age ; and to refer the words to the chastisement of the Edomites by Nebuchadnezzar is against the context of both verses. “To reveal (discover) sins” means to punish them ; for God uncovers the sins in order to punish them, *quemadmodum Deus peccata tegere dicitur, cum eorum pœnam remittit* (Rosenmüller) ; cf. Ps. xxxii. 1, 5, lxxxv. 3, etc.

CHAP. V.—A PRAYER TO THE LORD BY THE CHURCH, LANTHANING IN MISERY, FOR THE RESTORATION OF HER FORMER STATE OF GRACE.

- 1 Remember, O Jahveh, what hath happened to us; consider, and behold our reproach.
- 2 Our inheritance is turned to strangers, our houses to foreigners.
- 3 We are orphans, without a father; our mothers are as widows.
- 4 Our own water we drink for money, our own wood cometh to us in return for payment.
- 5 On our necks are we persecuted ; we are jaded,—there is no rest for us.
- 6 [Towards] Egypt we reach our hand,—[towards] Assyria, to satisfy ourselves [with] bread.
- 7 Our fathers sinned, they are not ; we bear their iniquities.
- 8 Servants rule us ; there is none to deliver us out of their hand.
- 9 At the risk of our life we bring in our bread, because of the sword of the wilderness.
- 10 Our skin gloweth with heat like a furnace, because of the fever-heat of hunger.
- 11 They have forced women in Zion, virgins in the cities of Judah.
- 12 Princes are hung up by their hand ; the face of the elders is not honoured.
- 13 Young men carry millstones, and lads stagger under [loads of] wood.
- 14 Elders cease from the gate, young men from their instrumental music.

15 The joy of our heart hath ceased, our dancing is turned into mourning.
 16 The crown of our head is fallen ; woe unto us, that we have sinned !
 17 Because of this our heart became sick ; because of these [things] our eyes became dark.
 18 Upon Mount Zion, which is laid waste, jackals roam through it.
 19 Thou, O Jahveh, dost sit [enthroned] for ever ; Thy throne is for generation and generation.
 20 Why dost thou forget us for ever,—forsake us for a length of days ?
 21 Lead us back, O Jahveh, to Thyself, that we may return ; renew our days, as of old.
 22 Or, hast Thou indeed utterly rejected us ? art Thou very wroth against us ?

This poem begins (ver. 1) with the request addressed to the Lord, that He would be pleased to think of the disgrace that has befallen Judah, and concludes (vers. 19-22) with the request that the Lord may not forsake His people for ever, but once more receive them into favour. The main portion of this petition is formed by the description of the disgrace and misery under which the suppliants groan, together with the acknowledgment (vers. 7 and 16) that they are compelled to bear the sins of their fathers and their own sins. By this confession, the description given of their misery is divided into two strophes (vers. 2-7 and 8-16), which are followed by the request for deliverance (vers. 19-22), introduced by vers. 17 and 18. The author of this prayer speaks throughout in the name of the people, or, to speak more correctly, in the name of the congregation, laying their distress and their supplication before the Lord. The view of Thenius,—that this poem originated among a small company of Jews who had been dispersed, and who, in the midst of constant persecution, sought a place of refuge from the oppression of the Chaldeans,—has been forced upon the text through the arbitrary interpretation of detached figurative expressions.

Vers. 1-7. Supplication and statement regarding the distress. The request made in ver. 1 refers to the oppression depicted in what follows. The words, “Remember, O Lord, what hath happened (*i.e.* befallen) us,” are more fully explained in the second member, “Look, and behold our disgrace.” It is quite arbitrary in Thenius to refer the first member to the past, the second to the present, described in what follows, vers. 12-16.

The *Qeri* הַבִּטְחָה is an unnecessary alteration, after i. 11, iii. 63.—With ver. 2 begins the description of the disgrace that has befallen them. This consists, first of all, in the fact that their inheritance has become the possession of strangers. Rosenmüller rightly explains נַחַלָה to mean, *terra quæ tuo nobis dono quondam est concessa*. נַחַתָּה is used of the transference of the property to others, as in Isa. ix. 5. Many expositors would refer בְּתִינִיָּה to the houses in Jerusalem which the Chaldeans had not destroyed, on the ground that it is stated, in 2 Kings xxv. 9 and Jer. lii. 13, that the Chaldeans destroyed none but large houses. There is no foundation, however, for this restriction; moreover, it is opposed by the parallel נַחַלָתָנִי. Just as by נַחַלָה we are to understand, not merely the possession of Jerusalem, but of the whole country, so also בְּתִינִיָּה are the dwelling-houses of the country in towns and villages; in this case, the question whether any houses still remained standing in Jerusalem does not demand consideration at all. Nägelsbach is wrong in his remark that נַחַלָה and בְּתִינִיָּה respectively mean immoveable and portable property, for houses are certainly not moveable property.—Ver. 3 is very variously interpreted by modern expositors. Ewald and Vaihinger understand “father” as meaning the king, while Thenius refers it specially to Zedekiah; the “mothers,” according to Ewald and Vaihinger, are the cities of Judah, while Thenius thinks they are the women of Zedekiah’s harem. But to call the women of the royal harem “mothers” of the nation, would be as unexampled as the attribution of the title to the cities of Judah. The second clause, “our mothers are like widows,” contains a simile: they are not really widows, but like widows, because they have lost the protection which the mother of a family has in her husband. In like manner, the first clause also is to be understood as a comparison. “We are fatherless orphans,” i.e. we are like such, as the Chaldee has paraphrased it. Accordingly, C. B. Michaelis, Pareau, Rosenmüller, Kalkschmidt, and Gerlach have rightly explained the words as referring to the custom of the Hebrews: *homines omni modo derelictos omnibusque praesidiis destitutos, pupillos et viduas dicere*; cf. Ps. xciv. 6, Isa. i. 17, Jas. i. 27.—Ver. 4. And not merely are the inhabitants of Judah without land and property, and deprived of all pro-

tection, like orphans and widows; they are also living in penury and want, and (ver. 5) under severe oppression and persecution. Water and wood are mentioned in ver. 4 as the greatest necessities of life, without which it is impossible to exist. Both of these they must buy for themselves, because the country, with its waters and forests, is in the possession of the enemy. The emphasis lies on “*our water . . . our wood.*” What they formerly had, as their own property, for nothing, they must now purchase. We must reject the historical interpretations of the words, and their application to the distress of the besieged (Michaelis); or to the exiles who complained of the dearness of water and wood in Egypt (Ewald); or to those who fled before the Chaldeans, and lived in waste places (Thenius); or to the multitudes of those taken prisoner after the capture of Jerusalem, who were so closely watched that they could not go where they liked to get water and wood, but were obliged to go to their keepers for permission, and pay dearly for their services (Nägelsbach). The purchase of water and wood can scarcely be taken literally, but must be understood as signifying that the people had to pay heavy duties for the use of the water and the wood which the country afforded.

—Ver. 5. “On our necks we are persecuted,” *i.e.* our persecutors are at our necks,—are always close behind us, to drive or hunt us on. It is inadmissible to supply any specific mention of the yoke (*imposito collo gravi servitutis jugo*, Raschi, Rosenmüller, Vaihinger, etc.); and we must utterly reject the proposal to connect “*our neck*” with ver. 4b (LXX., Syriac, J. D. Michaelis), inasmuch as the symmetry of the verses is thereby destroyed, nor is any suitable meaning obtained. “We are jaded: no rest is granted us.” **הַנְּפָתָח** is Hophal of **נְפָתָח**, to give rest to. The *Qeri* **נְפָתָח** instead of **נְפָתָח** is quite as unnecessary as in the case of **לְמַתָּח**, ver. 3, and **מַנְתָּחָא** and **מַנְתָּחָא** in ver. 7. The meaning of the verse is not, “we are driven over neck and head,” according to which the subject treated of would be the merciless treatment of the prisoners, through their being driven on (Nägelsbach); still less is it meant to be stated that the company to which the writer of the poem belonged was always tracked out, and hunted about in the waste places where they wished to hide themselves (Thenius). Neither

of these interpretations suits the preceding and succeeding context. Nor does the mention of being “persecuted on the neck” necessarily involve a pursuit of fugitives: it merely indicates incessant oppression on the side of the enemy, partly through continually being goaded on to hard labour, partly through annoyances of different kinds, by which the victors made their supremacy and their pride felt by the vanquished nation. In יְנַפֵּח there is contained neither the notion of tracking fugitives nor that of driving on prisoners.—Ver. 6. The meaning of יְנַפֵּח is more exactly defined by the superadded תְּמַלֵּחַ לְשָׁבֵעַ, which belongs to both members of the verse. “In order to satisfy ourselves with bread (so as to prolong our lives), we give the hand to Egypt, to Assyria.” מִצְרַיִם and אַשּׁוּר are local accusatives. To give the hand is a sign of submission or subjection; see on Jer. i. 15. Pareau has correctly given the meaning thus: *si victum nobis comparare velimus, vel Judea nobis relinquenda est atque Aegyptii sunt agnoscendi domini, vel si hic manemus, Chaldais victoribus nos subjiciamus necesse est; quocunque nos vertamus, nihil superest nisi tristissima servitus.* This complaint shows, moreover, that it is those in Judea who are speaking. יְנַפֵּח, “we give the hand,” shows that the assumption of Thenius,—that the writer here brings to remembrance the fate of two *other* companies of his fellow-countrymen who were not carried away into exile,—is an arbitrary insertion. *Asshur*, as the name of the great Asiatic empire, stands for Babylon, as in Ezra vi. 22, cf. Jer. ii. 18.—Ver. 7. “We suffer more than we are guilty of; we are compelled to bear the iniquities of our fathers,” *i.e.* to atone for their guilt. There is a great truth contained in the words, “Our fathers have sinned; they are no more; we bear their iniquities (or guilt).” For the fall of the kingdom had not been brought about by the guilt of that generation merely, and of none before; it was due also to the sins of their fathers before them, in previous generations. The same truth is likewise expressed in Jer. xvi. 11, xxxii. 18; and in 2 Kings xxiii. 26 it is stated that God did not cease from His great wrath because of the sins of Manasseh. But this truth would be perverted into error, if we were to understand the words as intimating that the speakers had considered themselves inno-

cent. This false view, however, they themselves opposed with the confession in ver. 16, "for we have sinned ;" thereby they point out their own sins as the cause of their misfortune. If we compare this confession with the verse now before us, this can only mean the following : "The misfortune we suffer has not been incurred by ourselves alone, but we are compelled to atone for the sins of our fathers also." In the same way, too, Jeremiah (chap. xvi. 11) threatens the infliction of a penal judgment, not merely "because your fathers have forsaken me (the Lord)," but he also adds, "and ye do still worse than your fathers." God does not punish the sins of the fathers in innocent children, but in children who continue the sins of the fathers ; cf. Isa. lxv. 7, and the explanation given of Jer. xxxi. 29 and Ezek. xviii. 2 ff. The design with which the suffering for the sins of the fathers is brought forward so prominently, and with such feeling, is merely to excite the divine compassion for those who are thus chastised.

Vers. 8–16. Further description of the miserable condition under which the congregation languishes. Ver. 8. "Servants rule over us," etc. עֲבָדִים are not the Chaldean soldiers, who are in 2 Kings xxiv. 10 designated the servants of Nebuchadnezzar (Pareau, Rosenmüller, Maurer) ; still less the Chaldeans, in so far as they, till shortly before, had been the subjects of the Assyrians (Kalkschmidt) ; nor the Chaldean satraps, as servants of the king of Babylon (Thenius, Ewald) ; nor even "slaves who had been employed as overseers and taskmasters of the captives while on the march" (Nägelsbach) ; but the Chaldeans. These are called servants, partly because of the despotic rule under which they were placed, partly in the sense already indicated by C. B. Michaelis, as being those *qui nobis potius, si pii fuisse-mus, servire debuissent*, in accordance with the analogous designation of Jerusalem as a princess among the countries of the world, i. 1.—Ver. 9. And in addition to this humiliation under dishonourable servitude, we can get our daily bread only at the risk of our life. Thus there is fulfilled to them the threatening in Deut. xxviii. 28, "Ye shall be servants among your enemies, in hunger and thirst, in nakedness and want of everything." בְּנֵפֶשׁנִי, "for the price of our soul," i.e. with our life at stake, we bring in our bread. The danger is more exactly described by

what is added : “ before the sword of the wilderness.” By this expression are meant the predatory Bedouins of the desert, who, falling upon those that were bringing in the bread, plundered, and probably even killed them. The bringing of the bread is not, however, to be referred (with Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Kalkschmidt) to the attempts made to procure bread from the neighbouring countries ; still less is it to be referred (with Thenius, Ewald, and Nägelsbach) to the need for “ wringing the bread from the desert and its plunderers ;” but it refers to the ingathering of the scanty harvest in the country devastated by war and by the visitations of predatory Bedouins : cf. 2 Sam. ix. 10, Hag. i. 6.—Ver. 10. The bread which we are thus obliged to struggle for, at the risk of our life, is not even sufficient to allay hunger, which consumes our bodies. נַכְמָר does not mean to be blackened (Chaldee, Kimchi, C. B. Michaelis, Maurer), but in Gen. xlivi. 30, 1 Kings iii. 26, and Hos. xi. 8, to be stirred up (of the bowels, compassion), hence to kindle, glow. This last meaning is required by the comparison with תנְפֵר, oven, furnace. This comparison does not mean *cutis nostra tanquam fornace adusta est* (Gesenius in *Thes.*, Kalkschmidt), still less “ black as an oven ” (Dietrich in *Ges. Lex.*), because תנְפֵר does not mean the oven viewed in respect of its blackness, but (from נָר) in respect of the fire burning in it. The meaning is, “ our skin glows like a baker’s oven ” (Vaihinger, Thenius, Nägelsbach, Gerlach),—a strong expression for the fever-heat produced by hunger. As to נִעְלָיִל, glowing heat, see on Ps. xi. 6.—Ver. 11 ff. With this must further be considered the maltreatment which persons of every station, sex, and age have to endure. Ver. 11. Women and virgins are dishonoured in Jerusalem, and in the other cities of the land. Ver. 12. Princes are suspended by the hand of the enemy (Ewald, contrary to the use of language, renders “ along with ” them). To hang those who had been put to death was something superadded to the simple punishment by death (Deut. xxi. 22 f.), and so far was a shameful kind of execution. “ The old men are not honoured,” i.e. dishonoured ; cf. iv. 16, Lev. xix. 32. The words are not to be restricted to the events mentioned in Jer. xxxix. 6, but also apply to the present con-

dition of those who are complaining.—Ver. 13. Youths and boys are forced to engage in heavy servile work. ^{טְחִין נְשָׁאִים} does not mean “they take them for the mill,” *ad molendum sumpserunt* (Ewald, Rosenmüller). Apart from the consideration that there is no ground for it in the language employed, such a view of the words does not accord with the parallelism. ^{טְחִין}, construed with a simple infinitive or accusative (without ^ל), does not mean “to take for something.” ^{טְחִין} is a substantive, “the mill.” “To bear (carry) the mill” signifies to work at and with the mill. We must think of the hand-mill, which was found in every household, and which could thus be carried from one place to another. Grinding was the work of slaves; see on Judg. xvi. 21. The carrying of the mill (not merely of the upper millstone) is mentioned as the heaviest portion of the work in grinding. “Boys stagger (fall down) on the wood laid on them to be carried,” *i.e.* under the burden of it. ^{פְּשָׁל} with ^{בְּ} means to stumble on something; here ^{בְּ} denotes the cause of the stumbling; cf. Jer. vi. 21, Lev. xxvi. 37 f. It is arbitrary to understand ^{מַלְיכָה} as meaning the wooden handle of the mill (Aben Ezra, and Bochart in *Hieroz.* i. 157, ed. Rosenmüller); the same must also be said regarding the opinion of Thenius and Nägelsbach, who refer the words to the dragging of the hand-mills, and of the wood necessary for baking bread for the comfort of the soldiers, on the march of the captives to Babylon.—Ver. 15 f. Under the pressure of such circumstances, all public meetings and amusements have ceased. “The elders cease from the gate.” The gate was the place of assembly for the people, not merely for deliberating upon public affairs (Ruth iv. 15; Josh. xx. 4), but also “for social entertainment (since there were no refreshment-rooms, coffeehouses, and public baths, such as are now to be found in the East), or even for quiet enjoyment in looking at the motley multitude of passers-by; Gen. xix. 1, 1 Sam. iv. 18, ix. 18, Job xxix. 7” (Winer’s *Bibl. R.W.B.* s.v. *Thor*). That the gate is here to be regarded as a place of entertainment and amusement, is shown by the parallel member, “young men cease from their instrumental music;” cf. i. 4. On ver. 15, cf. Jer. vii. 34, xvi. 9, and xxxi. 13; Ps. xxx. 12. Lastly, in ver. 16, the writer sums up the whole of the misery in the

complaint, “The crown of our head is fallen ! woe unto us, for we have sinned,” *i.e.* we suffer the punishment for our sins. “The *fallen crown* can only be a figurative expression for the honourable position of the people in its entirety, but which is now lost.” Such is the view which Ewald rightly takes ; on the other hand, the interpretation of Thenius, that “the ‘crown of our head’ is nothing else than Zion, together with its palaces, placed on Jerusalem, as it were on the head [of the country], and adorning it,” deserves mention simply as a curious specimen of exegetical fancy. Nägelsbach has gone too far in restricting the figurative expression to the crown of Jerusalem, which consisted in her being mistress among the nations, a princess among the regions of the earth (i. 1), the perfection of beauty, and the joy of the whole earth (ii. 15) ; for “our crown” is not equivalent to Jerusalem, or a crown on the head of Jerusalem.

Vers. 17-22. The request that the judgment of wrath may be averted, and that the former gracious condition may be restored. Vers. 17 and 18 form the transition to the request in vers. 19-22. “Because of this” and “because of these [things]” refer mainly to what precedes, yet not in such a way as that the former must be referred to the fact that sin has been committed, and the latter to the suffering. The two halves of the verse are unmistakeably parallel ; the sickening of the heart is essentially similar to the dimness coming on the eyes, the former indicating the sorrow of the soul, while the latter is the expression of this sorrow in tears. “Because of this (viz. because of the misery hitherto complained of) the heart has become sick,” and the grief of the heart finds vent in tears, in consequence of which the eyes have become dim ; cf. ii. 11. But this sorrow culminates in the view taken of the desolation of Mount Zion, which receives consideration, not because of its splendid palaces (Thenius), but as the holy mountain on which the house of God stood, for “Zion” comprehended Moriah ; see on Ps. ii. 6, ix. 12, lxxvi. 3. The glory formerly attaching to Mount Zion (Ps. xlvi. 3, l. 2) is departed ; the mountain has been so much laid waste, that jackals roam on it. שָׁוְלִים are not properly foxes, but jackals (as in Ps. lxiii. 11), which lodge among the ruins. רָאַגְתִּי is an intensive form, meaning to rove or roam about.—Ver. 19 ff. The glory of Zion, the earthly

habitation of the Lord, is at an end, but the throne of the Lord endures eternally. Through this thought, the lamentation rises to the prayer that the Lord may not forsake His people for ever, but re-establish His kingdom on the earth. "Thou, O Jahveh, art enthroned eternally." This thought is expressed as the ground of hope, in nearly the same words as are found in Ps. cii. 13. Jahveh is the God of salvation. Since His throne endures eternally in heaven, He cannot let His kingdom perish on the earth. On this is founded the request, "Why wilt Thou forget us for ever, forsake us for a length of days (*i.e.* through life, always, Ps. xxiii. 6)?" This the Lord cannot do, because of His grace. From this is developed the further request (ver. 21), "Lead us back to Thyself, that we may return." We must not restrict **הַשְׁׁבָּה** and **שָׁבָה** to conversion to the Lord (Kalkschmidt, Ewald, Vaihinger, Gerlach); they signify the re-establishment of the gracious relation, which is, of course, impossible without repentance and conversion on the part of Israel. It is wrong to refer the words to the restoration of the people to their native land, or to the re-establishment of the theocracy (Dathe, Thenius), because it is not the exiles who address this petition to the Lord. The mode in which we are to understand the "bringing back to Jahveh" is shown in the second hemistich, "renew our days, as they were in former times," *i.e.* vouchsafe to us again the life (or state of grace) which we enjoyed in former times. In ver. 22 this request is based on an argument introduced in a negative form. **מִנִּי** **כִּי**, after a negative clause, signifies *nisi*, but (Ger. *sondern*). This meaning developed into that of a strong limitation (cf. Ewald, § 356), unless = provided that. Thus literally here: "unless Thou hast utterly rejected us,—art very wroth against us." This case, however, is merely stated as a possibility, the actual occurrence of which is out of the question. The idea is the same as that expressed by Jeremiah (chap. xiv. 19) in the form of a question, in order to give greater emphasis to his intercession for his nation. The Lord cannot have utterly rejected His people Israel, because He would thereby make His name to be despised in the eyes of the nations (Jer. xiv. 21). Thus terminates this lamentation, with a request for whose fulfilment faith can hope with confidence.

In many Hebrew MSS. ver. 21 is found repeated after ver. 22, to make the whole more suitable for public reading in the synagogue, that the poem may not end with the mention of the wrath of God, as is the case also at the close of Isaiah, Malachi, and Ecclesiastes : the intention is, to conclude with words of comfort. But ver. 22, rightly understood, did not require this repetition : for, as Rhabanas has already remarked in *Ghisleri commentar.* on ver. 22 : *non hæc quasi desperando de salute populi sui locutus est, sed ut dolorem suum nimium de contritione et objectione diutina gentis suæ manifestaret.* This conclusion entirely agrees with the character of the Lamentations, in which complaint and supplication should continue to the end,—not, however, without an element of hope, although the latter may not rise to the heights of joyful victory, but, as Gerlach expresses himself, “merely glimmers from afar, like the morning star through the clouds, which does not indeed itself dispel the shadows of the night, though it announces that the rising of the sun is near, and that it shall obtain the victory.”

THE END.

T. & T. CLARK,
38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

GRIMM'S LEXICON.

Just published, in demy 4to, price 36s.,

**GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT,**

BEING

Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti.

TRANSLATED, REVISED, AND ENLARGED

BY

JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D.,

BUSSEY PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION IN THE
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

EXTRACT FROM PREFACE.

TOWARDS the close of the year 1862, the "Arnoldische Buchhandlung" in Leipzig published the First Part of a Greek-Latin Lexicon of the New Testament, prepared, upon the basis of the "Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica" of C. G. Wilke (second edition, 2 vols. 1851), by Professor C. L. WILIBALD GRIMM of Jena. In his Prospectus Professor Grimm announced it as his purpose not only (in accordance with the improvements in classical lexicography embodied in the Paris edition of Stephen's Thesaurus and in the fifth edition of Passow's Dictionary edited by Rost and his coadjutors) to exhibit the historical growth of a word's significations, and accordingly in selecting his vouchers for New Testament usage to show at what time and in what class of writers a given word became current, but also duly to notice the usage of the Septuagint and of the Old Testament Apocrypha, and especially to produce a Lexicon which should correspond to the present condition of textual criticism, of exegesis, and of biblical theology. He devoted more than seven years to his task. The successive Parts of his work received, as they appeared, the out-spoken commendation of scholars diverging as widely in their views as Hupfeld and Hengstenberg; and since its completion in 1868 it has been generally acknowledged to be by far the best Lexicon of the New Testament extant.'

'I regard it as a work of the greatest importance. . . . It seems to me a work showing the most patient diligence, and the most carefully arranged collection of useful and helpful references.'—THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

'The use of Professor Grimm's book for years has convinced me that it is not only unquestionably the best among existing New Testament Lexicons, but that, apart from all comparisons, it is a work of the highest intrinsic merit, and one which is admirably adapted to initiate a learner into an acquaintance with the language of the New Testament. It ought to be regarded as one of the first and most necessary requisites for the study of the New Testament, and consequently for the study of theology in general.'—Professor EMIL SCHÜRER.

'This is indeed a noble volume, and satisfies in these days of advancing scholarship a very great want. It is certainly unequalled in its lexicography, and invaluable in its literary perfectness. . . . It should, will, must make for itself a place in the library of all those students who want to be thoroughly furnished for the work of understanding, expounding, and applying the Word of God.'—*Evangelical Magazine*.

'Undoubtedly the best of its kind. Beautifully printed and well translated, with some corrections and improvements of the original, it will be prized by students of the Christian Scriptures.'—*Athenaeum*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 16s.,

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, FROM THE REFORMATION TO KANT.

BY BERNHARD PÜNJER.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY W. HASTIE, B.D.
WITH A PREFACE BY PROFESSOR FLINT, D.D., LL.D.

'The merits of Pünjer's history are not difficult to discover; on the contrary, they are of the kind which, as the French say, *sautent aux yeux*. The language is almost everywhers as plain and easy to apprehend as, considering the nature of the matter conveyed, it could be made. The style is simple, natural, and direct; the only sort of style appropriate to the subject. The amount of information imparted is most extensive, and strictly relevant. Nowhere else will a student get nearly so much knowledge as to what has been thought and written, within the area of Christendom, on the philosophy of religion. He must be an excessively learned man in that department who has nothing to learn from this book.'—*Extract from the Preface.*

'Pünjer's "History of the Philosophy of Religion" is fuller of information on its subject than any other book of the kind that I have either seen or heard of. The writing in it is, on the whole, clear, simple, and uninvolved. The Translation appears to me true to the German, and, at the same time, a piece of very satisfactory English. I should think the work would prove useful, or even indispensable, as well for clergymen as for professors and students.'—DR. HUTCHISON STIRLING.

'A book of wide and most detailed research, showing true philosophic grasp.'—PROFESSOR H. CALDERWOOD.

'We consider Dr. Pünjer's work the most valuable contribution to this subject which has yet appeared.'—*Church Bells.*

'Remarkable for the extent of ground covered, for systematic arrangement, lucidity of expression, and judicial impartiality.'—*London Quarterly Review.*

Just published, in Two Vols., in demy 8vo, price 21s.,

HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.

BY CARL FRIEDRICH KEIL,
DOCTOR AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY.

Third Improved and Corrected Edition.

NOTE.—This third edition is virtually a new book, for the learned Author has made large additions and corrections, bringing it up to the present state of knowledge.

'This work is the standard scientific treatise on Biblical Archaeology. It is a very mine of learning.'—*John Bull.*

'No mere dreary mass of details, but a very luminous, philosophical, and suggestive treatise. Many chapters are not simply invaluable to the student, but have also very direct homiletic usefulness.'—*Literary World.*

'A mine of biblical information, out of which the diligent student may dig precious treasures.'—*The Rock.*

'Keil's Biblical Archaeology will be a standard work from the day of its appearance.'—*Presbyterian Review.*

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE FORM OF THE CHRISTIAN TEMPLE.

*Being a Treatise on the Constitution of the
New Testament Church.*

BY THOMAS WITHEROW, D.D., LL.D.,
PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY IN MAGEE COLLEGE, LONDONDERRY.

'We welcome the appearance of another work from the scholarly pen of Dr. Witherow. . . . No such able discussion of the constitution of the New Testament Church has appeared for a long time.'—*The Witness.*

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In Two Vols., demy 8vo.—Vol. I. now ready, price 10s. 6d.,

A NEW COMMENTARY

ON

THE BOOK OF GENESIS.

BY PROFESSOR FRANZ DELITZSCH, D.D.

MESSRS. CLARK have pleasure in intimating, that by special arrangement with the author they are publishing a translation of the Fifth Edition, thoroughly revised, and in large part re-written, of this standard Commentary. The learned author, who has for a generation been one of the foremost biblical scholars of Germany, and who is revered alike for his learning and his piety, has here stated with evident care his latest and most matured opinions.

‘Thirty-five years have elapsed since Prof. Delitzsch’s Commentary on Genesis first appeared; fifteen years since the fourth edition was published in 1872. Ever in the van of historical and philological research, the venerable author now comes forward with another fresh edition in which he incorporates what fifteen years have achieved for illustration and criticism of the text of Genesis. . . . We congratulate Prof. Delitzsch on this new edition, and trust that it may appear before long in an English dress. By it, not less than by his other commentaries, he has earned the gratitude of every lover of biblical science, and we shall be surprised if, in the future, many do not acknowledge that they have found in it a welcome help and guide.’—Professor S. R. DRIVER, in *The Academy*.

Just published, in post 8vo, price 9s.,

THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH:

OR,

A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the Variations in the LXX. Retranslated into the Original and Explained.

BY PROFESSOR G. C. WORKMAN, M.A.,
VICTORIA UNIVERSITY, COBURG, CANADA.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY PROFESSOR F. DELITZSCH, D.D.

Besides discussing the relation between the texts, this book solves the difficult problem of the variations, and reveals important matter for the history, the interpretations, the correction, and the reconstruction of the present Massoretic text.

‘A work of valuable and lasting service.’—Professor DELITZSCH.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE BOOK OF PSALMS.

The Structural Connection of the Book of Psalms both in single Psalms and in the Psalter as an organic whole.

BY JOHN FORBES, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, ABERDEEN.

‘One cannot but admire the keenness of insight and deftness of handling with which thought is balanced against thought, line against line, stanza against stanza, poem against poem. Only long familiarity and loving research could have given such skill and ease of movement. . . . A more suggestive, able, and original biblical monograph has not appeared recently, the contents and purport of which commend themselves more powerfully to believers in the Christian revelation and the inspiration of the Scriptures.’—*British and Foreign Evangelical Review*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

THE JEWISH

AND

THE CHRISTIAN MESSIAH.

A STUDY IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

By VINCENT HENRY STANTON, M.A.,

FELLOW, TUTOR, AND DIVINITY LECTURER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE;
LATE HULSEAN LECTURER.

'Mr. Stanton's book answers a real want, and will be indispensable to students of the origin of Christianity. We hope that Mr. Stanton will be able to continue his labours in that most obscure and most important period, of his competency to deal with which he has given such good proof in this book.'—*Guardian*.

'We welcome this book as a valuable addition to the literature of a most important subject. . . . The book is remarkable for the clearness of its style. Mr. Stanton is never obscure from beginning to end, and we think that no reader of average attainments will be able to put the book down without having learnt much from his lucid and scholarly exposition.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

Now ready, Second Division; in Three Vols., 8vo, price 10s. 6d. each,

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF OUR LORD.

By DR. EMIL SCHÜRER,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GIESSEN.

TRANSLATED FROM THE SECOND EDITION (REVISED THROUGHOUT, AND
GREATLY ENLARGED) OF '*HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIME*'.

The First Division, which will probably be in a single volume, is undergoing revision
by the Author. (The Second Division is complete in itself.)

'Under Professor Schürer's guidance, we are enabled to a large extent to construct a
social and political framework for the Gospel History, and to set it in such a light as to
see new evidences of the truthfulness of that history and of its contemporaneity. . . .
The length of our notice shows our estimate of the value of his work.'—*English
Churchman*.

'We gladly welcome the publication of this most valuable work.'—*Dublin Review*.

'Most heartily do we commend this work as an invaluable aid in the intelligent study
of the New Testament.'—*Nonconformist*.

'As a handbook for the study of the New Testament, the work is invaluable and
unique.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

AN EXPLANATORY COMMENTARY ON ESTHER.

With Four Appendices,

CONSISTING OF

THE SECOND TARGUM TRANSLATED FROM THE ARAMAIC
WITH NOTES, MITHRA, THE WINGED BULLS
OF PERSEPOLIS, AND ZOROASTER.

By PROFESSOR PAULUS CASSEL, D.D., BERLIN.

'A specially remarkable exposition, which will secure for itself a commanding
position in Biblical literature. It has great charms from a literary and historical point
of view.'—*Sword and Trowel*.

'A perfect mine of information.'—*Record*.

'It is manifestly the ready expression of a full and richly stored mind, dispensing the
treasures accumulated by years of labour and research. . . . No one whose fortune it is
to secure this commentary will rise from its study without a new and lively realization
of the life, trials, and triumphs of Esther and Mordecai.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

LOTZE'S MICROCOsmus.

Just published, in Two Vols., 8vo (1450 pages), SECOND EDITION, price 36s.,

MICROCOsmus:

Concerning Man and his relation to the World.

BY HERMANN LOTZE.

Translated from the German

BY ELIZABETH HAMILTON AND E. E. CONSTANCE JONES.

'The English public have now before them the greatest philosophic work produced in Germany by the generation just past. The translation comes at an opportune time, for the circumstances of English thought, just at the present moment, are peculiarly those with which Lotze attempted to deal when he wrote his "Microcosmus," a quarter of a century ago. . . . Few philosophic books of the century are so attractive both in style and matter.'—*Athenæum*.

'These are indeed two masterly volumes, vigorous in intellectual power, and translated with rare ability. . . . This work will doubtless find a place on the shelves of all the foremost thinkers and students of modern times.'—*Evangelical Magazine*.

'Lotze is the ablest, the most brilliant, and most renowned of the German philosophers of to-day. . . . He has rendered invaluable and splendid service to Christian thinkers, and has given them a work which cannot fail to equip them for the sturdiest intellectual conflicts and to ensure their victory.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

'The reputation of Lotze both as a scientist and a philosopher, no less than the merits of the work itself, will not fail to secure the attention of thoughtful readers.'—*Scotsman*.

'The translation of Lotze's Microcosmus is the most important of recent events in our philosophical literature. . . . The discussion is carried on on the basis of an almost encyclopædic knowledge, and with the profoundest and subtlest critical insight. We know of no other work containing so much of speculative suggestion, of keen criticism, and of sober judgment on these topics.'—*Andover Review*.

In Two Vols., 8vo, price 21s.,

NATURE AND THE BIBLE:

LECTURES ON THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF CREATION IN ITS
RELATION TO NATURAL SCIENCE.

BY DR. FR. H. REUSCH.

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION BY KATHLEEN LYTTELTON.

'Other champions much more competent and learned than myself might have been placed in the field; I will only name one of the most recent, Dr. Reusch, author of "Nature and the Bible."'-The Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE.

'The work, we need hardly say, is of profound and perennial interest, and it can scarcely be too highly commended as, in many respects, a very successful attempt to settle one of the most perplexing questions of the day. It is impossible to read it without obtaining larger views of theology, and more accurate opinions respecting its relations to science, and no one will rise from its perusal without feeling a deep sense of gratitude to its author.'—*Scottish Review*.

'This graceful and accurate translation of Dr. Reusch's well-known treatise on the identity of the doctrines of the Bible and the revelations of Nature is a valuable addition to English literature.'—*Whitehall Review*.

'We owe to Dr. Reusch, a Catholic theologian, one of the most valuable treatises on the relation of Religion and Natural Science that has appeared for many years. Its fine impartial tone, its absolute freedom from passion, its glow of sympathy with all sound science, and its liberality of religious views, are likely to surprise all readers who are unacquainted with the fact that, whatever may be the errors of the Romish Church, its more enlightened members are, as a rule, free from that idolatry of the letter of Scripture which is one of the most dangerous faults of ultra-Protestantism.'—*Literary World*.

Just published, in post 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

THE PREACHERS OF SCOTLAND FROM THE SIXTH TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

TWELFTH SERIES OF CUNNINGHAM LECTURES

BY W. G. BLAIKIE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF APOLOGETICS AND PASTORAL THEOLOGY, THE NEW COLLEGE,
EDINBURGH.

'Exceedingly interesting and well worth reading both for information and pleasure. . . . A better review of Scottish preaching from an evangelical standpoint could not be desired.'—*Scotsman.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 3s. 6d.,

SECOND EDITION, REVISED

THE THEOLOGY

AND

THEOLOGIANS OF SCOTLAND, CHIEFLY OF THE

Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.

Being one of the 'Cunningham Lectures.'

BY JAMES WALKER, D.D., CARNWATH.

'These pages glow with fervent and eloquent rejoinder to the cheap scorn and scurrilous satire poured out upon evangelical theology as it has been developed north of the Tweed.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'We do not wonder that in their delivery Dr. Walker's lectures excited great interest; we should have wondered far more if they had not done so.'—MR. SPURGEON in *Sword and Trowel.*

In Two Vols., 8vo, price 21s.,

A SYSTEM OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

BY THE LATE

W. LINDSAY ALEXANDER, D.D., LL.D.,

PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL HALL OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES
IN SCOTLAND.

'A work like this is of priceless advantage. It is the testimony of a powerful and accomplished mind to the supreme authority of the Scriptures, a lucid and orderly exhibition of their contents, and a vindication, at once logical, scholarly, and conclusive, of their absolute sufficiency and abiding truthfulness. It is a pleasure to read lectures so vigorous and comprehensive in their grasp, so subtle in their dialect, so reverent in spirit, and so severely chaste in their style. There are scores of men who would suffer no loss if for the next couple of years they read no other book than this. To master it thoroughly would be an incalculable gain.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'This is probably the most interesting and scholarly system of theology on the lines of orthodoxy which has seen the light.'—*Literary World.*

'This has been characterised as probably the most valuable contribution which our country has made to theology during the present century, and we do not think this an exaggerated estimate.'—*Scottish Congregationalist.*

'Oh, that Scotland and Congregationalism had many worthies like Dr. Lindsay Alexander! . . . The ripe man, full of rich experience and heavenly knowledge, will prize each leaf, and give himself a glorious drilling as he masters chapter by chapter.'—MR. SPURGEON in *The Sword and Trowel.*

WORKS BY PROFESSOR I. A. DORNER.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 14s.

SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

BY DR. I. A. DORNER,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, BERLIN.

EDITED BY DR. A. DORNER.

TRANSLATED BY

PROFESSOR C. M. MEAD, D.D., AND REV. R. T. CUNNINGHAM, M.A.

'This noble book is the crown of the Systematic Theology of the author. . . . It is a masterpiece. It is the fruit of a lifetime of profound investigation in the philosophical, biblical, and historical sources of theology. The system of Dorner is comprehensive, profound, evangelical, and catholic. It rises into the clear heaven of Christian thought above the strifes of Scholasticism, Rationalism, and Mysticism. It is, indeed, comprehensive of all that is valuable in these three types of human thought.'

—Professor C. A. BRIGGS, D.D.

'There rested on his whole being a consecration such as is lent only by the nobility of a thorough sanctification of the inmost nature, and by the dignity of a matured wisdom.'—Professor WEISS.

'This is the last work we shall obtain from the able pen of the late Dr. Dorner, and it may be said that it fitly crowns the edifice of his manifold labours.'—*Spectator*.

In Four Volumes, 8vo, price £2, 2s.,

A SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

'In all investigations the author is fair, clear, and moderate; . . . he has shown that his work is one to be valued, for its real ability, as an important contribution to the literature of theology.'—*Scotsman*.

'Had it been the work of an entire lifetime, it would have been a monument of marvellous industry and rare scholarship. It is a tribute alike to the genius, the learning, and the untiring perseverance of its author.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

'The work has many and great excellencies, and is really indispensable to all who would obtain a thorough acquaintance with the great problems of theology. It is a great benefit to English students that it should be made accessible to them in their own language, and in a form so elegant and convenient.'—*Literary Churchman*.

In Five Volumes, 8vo, price £2, 12s. 6d.,

HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

'So great a mass of learning and thought so ably set forth has never before been presented to English readers, at least on this subject.'—*Journal of Sacred Literature*.

In crown 8vo, price 4s. 6d.,

**THE BIBLE
AN OUTGROWTH OF THEOCRATIC LIFE.**

BY D. W. SIMON,

PRINCIPAL OF THE CONGREGATIONAL COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

'A more valuable and suggestive book has not recently come into our hands.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

'This book will well repay perusal. It contains a great deal of learning as well as ingenuity, and the style is clear.'—*Guardian*.

'A book of absorbing interest, and well worthy of study.'—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine*.

'Dr. Simon's little book is worthy of the most careful attention.'—*Baptist*.

'We have read the book with much appreciation, and heartily commend it to all interested in the subject with which it deals.'—*Scottish Congregationalist*.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

New Edition, Re-written and Enlarged.

APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 1-100. Two Vols. Ex. demy 8vo, price 21s.

ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 100-325. Two Vols. Ex. demy 8vo, price 21s.

NICENE and POST-NICENE CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 325-600. Two Vols. Ex. demy 8vo, price 21s.

MEDIÆVAL CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 590-1073. Two Vols. Ex. demy 8vo, price 21s.
(Completion of this Period, 1073-1517, in preparation.)

MODERN CHRISTIANITY. The German Reformation, A.D. 1517-1530. Two Vols.
Ex. demy 8vo, price 21s.

'Dr. Schaff's "History of the Christian Church" is the most valuable contribution to Ecclesiastical History that has ever been published in this country. When completed it will have no rival in point of comprehensiveness, and in presenting the results of the most advanced scholarship and the latest discoveries. Each division covers a separate and distinct epoch, and is complete in itself.'

'No student, and indeed no critic, can with fairness overlook a work like the present, written with such evident candour, and, at the same time, with so thorough a knowledge of the sources of early Christian history.'—*Scotsman*.

'In no other work of its kind with which I am acquainted will students and general readers find so much to instruct and interest them.'—*Rev. Prof. HITCHCOCK, D.D.*

'A work of the freshest and most conscientious research.'—*Dr. JOSEPH COOK, in Boston Monday Lectures.*

'Dr. Schaff presents a connected history of all the great movements of thought and action in a pleasant and memorable style. His discrimination is keen, his courage undaunted, his candour transparent, and for general readers he has produced what we have no hesitation in pronouncing the History of the Church.'—*Freeman.*

Just published in ex. 8vo, Second Edition, price 9s.,

THE OLDEST CHURCH MANUAL CALLED THE Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.

The Didachè and Kindred Documents in the Original, with Translations and Discussions of Post-Apostolic Teaching, Baptism, Worship, and Discipline, and with Illustrations and Fac-Similes of the Jerusalem Manuscript.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,
PROFESSOR IN UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

'The best work on the Didachè which has yet appeared.'—*Churchman.*

'Dr. Schaff's "Oldest Church Manual" is by a long way the ablest, most complete, and in every way valuable edition of the recently-discovered "Teaching of the Apostles" which has been or is likely to be published. . . . Dr. Schaff's Prolegomena will henceforth be regarded as indispensable. . . . We have nothing but praise for this most scholarly and valuable edition of the Didachè. We ought to add that it is enriched by a striking portrait of Bryennios and many other useful illustrations.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

